In the Senate of the United States,

May 23, 1996.

Resolved, That the resolution from the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 178) entitled "Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.", do pass with the following

AMENDMENT:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

1 SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

- 2 FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.
- 3 (a) Declaration.—The Congress determines and de-
- 4 clares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on
- 5 the budget for fiscal year 1997, including the appropriate
- 6 budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and
- 7 2001, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budg-
- 8 et Act of 1974, and including the appropriate levels for fis-
- 9 cal year 2002.

1 (b) Table of Contents for

2 this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1997.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

- Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
- Sec. 102. Debt increase.
- Sec. 103. Social Security.
- Sec. 104. Major functional categories.
- Sec. 105. Reconciliation.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

- Sec. 201. Discretionary spending limits.
- Sec. 202. Tax reserve fund in the Senate.
- Sec. 203. Superfund reserve fund in the Senate.
- Sec. 204. Scoring of emergency legislation.
- Sec. 205. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND SENATE

- Sec. 301. Sense of the Congress on sale of Government assets.
- Sec. 302. Sense of the Congress that tax reductions should benefit working families.
- Sec. 303. Sense of the Congress on a Bipartisan Commission on the Solvency of Medicare.
- Sec. 304. Sense of the Senate on considering a change in the minimum wage in the Senate.
- Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate on long term projections in budget estimates.
- Sec. 306. Sense of the Congress on medicare transfers.
- Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate on repeal of the gas tax.
- Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate on medicare trustees report.
- Sec. 309. Sense of the Congress regarding changes in the medicare program.
- Sec. 310. Sense of the Senate on funding to assist youth at risk.
- Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate regarding the use of budgetary savings.
- Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate regarding the transfer of excess Government computers to public schools.
- Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate on Federal retreats.
- Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate regarding the essential air service program of the Department of Transportation.
- Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate regarding equal retirement savings for homemakers.
- Sec. 316. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Institute of Drug Abuse.
- Sec. 317. Sense of the Senate regarding the extension of the employer education assistance exclusion under section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.
- Sec. 318. Sense of the Senate regarding the Economic Development Administration placing high priority on maintaining field-based economic development representatives.
- Sec. 319. Sense of the Senate regarding revenue assumptions.
- Sec. 320. Sense of the Senate regarding domestic violence.
- Sec. 321. Sense of the Senate regarding student loans.
- Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate regarding reduction of the national debt.

- Sec. 323. Sense of the Senate regarding hungry or homeless children.
- Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate on LIHEAP.
- Sec. 325. Sense of the Congress regarding additional charges under the medicare program.
- Sec. 326. Sense of the Congress regarding nursing home standards.
- Sec. 327. Sense of the Congress concerning nursing home care.
- Sec. 328. Sense of the Congress regarding requirements that welfare recipients be drug-free.
- Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate on Davis-Bacon.
- Sec. 330. Sense of the Senate on Davis-Bacon.
- Sec. 331. Sense of Congress on reimbursement of the United States for Operations Southern Watch and Provide Comfort.
- Sec. 332. Accurate index for inflation.
- Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate on solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund.
- Sec. 334. Sense of the Congress that the 1993 income tax increase on social security benefits should be repealed.
- Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate regarding the Administration's practice regarding the prosecution of drug smugglers.
- Sec. 336. Corporate subsidies and sale of Government assets.
- Sec. 337. Sense of the Senate on the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.
- Sec. 338. Sense of the Senate regarding welfare reform.
- Sec. 339. A resolution regarding the Senate's support for Federal, State, and local law enforcement.
- Sec. 340. Sense of the Senate regarding the funding of Amtrak.
- Sec. 341. Sense of the Senate—Truth in Budgeting.

1 TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

2 SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

- 3 The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the
- 4 fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:
- 5 (1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the
- 6 enforcement of this resolution—
- 7 (A) The recommended levels of Federal reve-
- 8 nues are as follows:
- 9 Fiscal year 1997: \$1,086,200,000,000.
- 10 Fiscal year 1998: \$1,129,900,000,000.
- 11 Fiscal year 1999: \$1,176,100,000,000.
- 12 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,229,900,000,000.
- 13 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,289,600,000,000.
- 14 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,359,100,000,000.

1	(B) The amounts by which the aggregate
2	levels of Federal revenues should be changed are
3	as follows:
4	Fiscal year 1997: -\$14,100,000,000.
5	Fiscal year 1998: -\$18,600,000,000.
6	Fiscal year 1999: -\$22,300,000,000.
7	Fiscal year 2000: -\$21,900,000,000.
8	Fiscal year 2001: -\$21,500,000,000.
9	Fiscal year 2002: -\$14,800,000,000.
10	(C) The amounts for Federal Insurance
11	Contributions Act revenues for hospital insur-
12	ance within the recommended levels of Federal
13	revenues are as follows:
14	Fiscal year 1997: \$108,000,000,000.
15	Fiscal year 1998: \$113,100,000,000.
16	Fiscal year 1999: \$119,200,000,000.
17	Fiscal year 2000: \$125,500,000,000.
18	Fiscal year 2001: \$131,300,000,000.
19	Fiscal year 2002: \$137,700,000,000.
20	(2) New budget authority.—For purposes of
21	the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate lev-
22	els of total new budget authority are as follows:
23	Fiscal year 1997: \$1,323,100,000,000.
24	Fiscal year 1998: \$1,361,600,000,000.
25	Fiscal year 1999: \$1,392,400,000,000.

1	Fiscal year 2000: \$1,433,600,000,000.
2	Fiscal year 2001: \$1,454,000,000,000.
3	Fiscal year 2002: \$1,499,100,000,000.
4	(3) Budget outlays.—For purposes of the en-
5	forcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of
6	total budget outlays are as follows:
7	Fiscal year 1997: \$1,318,600,000,000.
8	Fiscal year 1998: \$1,353,500,000,000.
9	Fiscal year 1999: \$1,382,400,000,000.
10	Fiscal year 2000: \$1,415,600,000,000.
11	Fiscal year 2001: \$1,433,100,000,000.
12	Fiscal year 2002: \$1,467,400,000,000.
13	(4) Deficits.—For purposes of the enforcement
14	of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as
15	follows:
16	Fiscal year 1997: \$232,400,000,000.
17	Fiscal year 1998: \$223,600,000,000.
18	Fiscal year 1999: \$206,300,000,000.
19	Fiscal year 2000: \$185,700,000,000.
20	Fiscal year 2001: \$143,500,000,000.
21	Fiscal year 2002: \$108,300,000,000.
22	(5) Public debt.—The appropriate levels of the
23	public debt are as follows:
24	Fiscal year 1997: \$5,449,000,000,000.
25	Fiscal year 1998: \$5,722,700,000,000.

1	Fiscal year 1999: \$5,975,100,000,000.
2	Fiscal year 2000: \$6,207,700,000,000.
3	Fiscal year 2001: \$6,398,600,000,000.
4	Fiscal year 2002: \$6,550,500,000,000.
5	(6) Direct loan obligations.—The appro-
6	priate levels of total new direct loan obligations are
7	as follows:
8	Fiscal year 1997: \$41,400,000,000.
9	Fiscal year 1998: \$36,400,000,000.
10	Fiscal year 1999: \$36,600,000,000.
11	Fiscal year 2000: \$36,500,000,000.
12	Fiscal year 2001: \$36,600,000,000.
13	Fiscal year 2002: \$36,600,000,000.
14	(7) Primary Loan Guarantee commit-
15	MENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan
15 16	MENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:
16	guarantee commitments are as follows:
16 17	guarantee commitments are as follows: Fiscal year 1997: \$267,100,000,000.
16 17 18	guarantee commitments are as follows: Fiscal year 1997: \$267,100,000,000. Fiscal year 1998: \$267,800,000,000.
16 17 18 19	guarantee commitments are as follows: Fiscal year 1997: \$267,100,000,000. Fiscal year 1998: \$267,800,000,000. Fiscal year 1999: \$268,600,000,000.
16 17 18 19 20	guarantee commitments are as follows: Fiscal year 1997: \$267,100,000,000. Fiscal year 1998: \$267,800,000,000. Fiscal year 1999: \$268,600,000,000. Fiscal year 2000: \$269,700,000,000.
16 17 18 19 20 21	guarantee commitments are as follows: Fiscal year 1997: \$267,100,000,000. Fiscal year 1998: \$267,800,000,000. Fiscal year 1999: \$268,600,000,000. Fiscal year 2000: \$269,700,000,000. Fiscal year 2001: \$270,400,000,000.
16171819202122	guarantee commitments are as follows: Fiscal year 1997: \$267,100,000,000. Fiscal year 1998: \$267,800,000,000. Fiscal year 1999: \$268,600,000,000. Fiscal year 2000: \$269,700,000,000. Fiscal year 2001: \$270,400,000,000. Fiscal year 2002: \$271,300,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 1997: \$290,000,000,000. 2 Fiscal year 1998: \$277,400,000,000. 3 Fiscal year 1999: \$256,000,000,000. 4 Fiscal year 2000: \$236,100,000,000. 5 Fiscal year 2001: \$193,300,000,000. 6 Fiscal year 2002: \$155,400,000,000. 7 SEC. 103. SOCIAL SECURITY. 8 (a) Social Security Revenues.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, and 311 of the 10 Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust 11 Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows: 13 14 Fiscal year 1997: \$384,900,000,000. 15 Fiscal year 1998: \$401,900,000,000. 16 Fiscal year 1999: \$422,800,000,000. 17 Fiscal year 2000: \$444,200,000,000. 18 Fiscal year 2001: \$463,900,000,000. 19 Fiscal year 2002: \$485,700,000,000. 20 Social Security Outlays.—For purposes of 21 Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays 23 of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are

as follows:

25

1	Fiscal year 1997: \$310,400,000,000.
2	Fiscal year 1998: \$323,000,000,000.
3	Fiscal year 1999: \$335,900,000,000.
4	Fiscal year 2000: \$349,300,000,000.
5	Fiscal year 2001: \$363,900,000,000.
6	Fiscal year 2002: \$378,800,000,000.
7	SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.
8	The Congress determines and declares that the appro-
9	priate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new
10	direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee
11	commitments for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 for each
12	major functional category are:
13	(1) National Defense (050):
14	Fiscal year 1997:
15	(A) New budget authority,
16	\$265,600,000,000.
17	(B) Outlays, \$263,700,000.
18	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
20	ments, \$800,000,000.
21	Fiscal year 1998:
22	(A) New budget authority,
23	\$267,100,000,000.
24	(B) Outlays, \$262,100,000,000.
25	(C) New direct loan obligations. \$0.

1	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
2	ments, \$200,000,000.
3	Fiscal year 1999:
4	(A) New budget authority,
5	\$269,500,000,000.
6	(B) Outlays, \$265,100,000,000.
7	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
8	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
9	ments, \$192,000,000.
10	Fiscal year 2000:
11	(A) New budget authority,
12	\$271,800,000,000.
13	(B) Outlays, \$268,600,000,000.
14	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
15	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
16	ments, \$187,000,000.
17	Fiscal year 2001:
18	(A) New budget authority,
19	\$274,200,000,000.
20	(B) Outlays, \$267,500,000,000.
21	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
22	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
23	ments, \$185,000,000.
24	Fiscal year 2002:

1	(A)	New	budget	authority,
2	\$276,900,00	00,000.		
3	(B) Ou	ıtlays, \$26	7,200,000,00	90.
4	(C) Ne	w direct lo	an obligatio	ons, \$0.
5	(D) Ne	ew primar	ry loan gua	rantee commit-
6	ments, \$183	3,000,000.		
7	(2) International	l Affairs (1	50):	
8	Fiscal year	1997:		
9	(A) Ne	w budget	authority, \$	214,200,000,000.
10	(B) Ou	utlays, \$14	,900,000,000).
11	(C)	New de	irect loan	obligations,
12	\$4,333,000,0	000.		
13	(D) No	ew primar	ry loan gua	rantee commit-
14	ments, \$18,	110,000,00	0.	
15	Fiscal year	1998:		
16	(A) Ne	w budget	authority, \$	12,700,000,000.
17	(B) Ou	itlays, \$13,	,600,000,000).
18	(C)	New de	irect loan	obligations,
19	\$4,342,000,0	000.		
20	(D) Ne	ew primar	ry loan gua	rantee commit-
21	ments, \$18,2	262,000,00	0.	
22	Fiscal year	1999:		
23	(A) Ne	w budget	authority, \$	11,600,000,000.
24	(R) Ou	ıtlaus \$12	.600.000.000)

1	(C) New direct loan obligations,
2	\$4,358,000,000.
3	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
4	ments, \$18,311,000,000.
5	Fiscal year 2000:
6	(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
7	(B) Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.
8	(C) New direct loan obligations,
9	\$4,346,000,000.
10	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
11	ments, \$18,311,000,000.
12	Fiscal year 2001:
13	(A) New budget authority, \$12,400,000,000.
14	(B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.
15	(C) New direct loan obligations,
16	\$4,395,000,000.
17	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
18	ments, \$18,409,000,000.
19	Fiscal year 2002:
20	(A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.
21	(B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.
22	(C) New direct loan obligations,
23	\$4,387,000,000.
24	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
25	ments, \$18,409,000,000.

1	(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
2	Fiscal year 1997:
3	(A) New budget authority, \$16,700,000,000.
4	(B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.
5	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
6	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
7	ments, \$0.
8	Fiscal year 1998:
9	(A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
10	(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.
11	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
12	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
13	ments, \$0.
14	Fiscal year 1999:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$15,900,000,000.
17	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
18	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
19	ments, \$0.
20	Fiscal year 2000:
21	(A) New budget authority, \$15,400,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$15,500,000,000.
23	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
24	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
25	ments, \$0.

1	Fiscal year 2001:
2	(A) New budget authority, \$15,500,000,000.
3	(B) Outlays, \$15,500,000,000.
4	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
5	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
6	ments, \$0.
7	Fiscal year 2002:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$15,500,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$15,500,000,000.
10	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
11	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
12	ments, \$0.
13	(4) Energy (270):
14	Fiscal year 1997:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$3,700,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$3,100,000,000.
17	(C) New direct loan obligations,
18	\$1,033,000,000.
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
20	ments, \$0.
21	Fiscal year 1998:
22	(A) New budget authority, \$2,900,000,000.
23	(B) Outlays, \$2,200,000,000.
24	(C) New direct loan obligations,
25	\$1,039,000,000.

1	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
2	ments, \$0.
3	Fiscal year 1999:
4	(A) New budget authority, \$2,600,000,000.
5	(B) Outlays, \$1,800,000,000.
6	(C) New direct loan obligations,
7	\$1,045,000,000.
8	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
9	ments, \$0.
10	Fiscal year 2000:
11	(A) New budget authority, \$2,500,000,000.
12	(B) Outlays, \$1,600,000,000.
13	(C) New direct loan obligations,
14	\$1,036,000,000.
15	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
16	ments, \$0.
17	Fiscal year 2001:
18	(A) New budget authority, \$2,700,000,000.
19	(B) Outlays, \$1,600,000,000.
20	(C) New direct loan obligations,
21	\$1,000,000,000.
22	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
23	ments, \$0.
24	Fiscal year 2002:
25	(A) New budget authority, \$2,400,000,000.

1	(B) Outlays, \$1,200,000,000.
2	(C) New direct loan obligations,
3	\$1,031,000,000.
4	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
5	ments, \$0.
6	(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
7	Fiscal year 1997:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$20,300,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$21,500,000.
10	(C) New direct loan obligations,
11	\$37,000,000.
12	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
13	ments, \$0.
14	Fiscal year 1998:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$20,000,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$20,900,000,000.
17	(C) New direct loan obligations,
18	\$41,000,000,000.
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
20	ments, \$0.
21	Fiscal year 1999:
22	(A) New budget authority, \$19,900,000,000.
23	(B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.
24	(C) New direct loan obligations,
25	\$38,000,000.

1	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-	
2	ments, \$0.	
3	Fiscal year 2000:	
4	(A) New budget authority, \$19,500,000,000.	
5	(B) Outlays, \$20,100,000,000.	
6	(C) New direct loan obligations,	
7	\$38,000,000.	
8	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-	
9	ments, \$0.	
10	Fiscal year 2001:	
11	(A) New budget authority, \$19,400,000,000.	
12	(B) Outlays, \$19,600,000,000.	
13	(C) New direct loan obligations,	
14	\$38,000,000.	
15	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-	
16	ments, \$0.	
17	Fiscal year 2002:	
18	(A) New budget authority, \$19,300,000,000.	
19	(B) Outlays, \$19,400,000,000.	
20	(C) New direct loan obligations,	
21	\$38,000,000.	
22	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-	
23	ments, \$0.	
24	(6) Agriculture (350):	
25	Fiscal year 1997:	

1	(A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.
2	(B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
3	(C) New direct loan obligations,
4	\$7,794,000,000.
5	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
6	ments, \$5,870,000,000.
7	Fiscal year 1998:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.
10	(C) New direct loan obligations,
11	\$9,346,000,000.
12	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
13	ments, \$6,637,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 1999:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.
17	(C) New direct loan obligations,
18	\$10,743,000,000.
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
20	$ments,\ \$6,586,000,000.$
21	Fiscal year 2000:
22	(A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.
23	(B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.
24	(C) New direct loan obligations,
25	\$10,736,000,000.

1	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
2	ments, \$6,652,000,000.
3	Fiscal year 2001:
4	(A) New budget authority, \$10,500,000,000.
5	(B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.
6	(C) New direct loan obligations,
7	\$10,595,000,000.
8	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
9	ments, \$6,641,000,000.
10	Fiscal year 2002:
11	(A) New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.
12	(B) Outlays, \$8,400,000,000.
13	(C) New direct loan obligations,
14	\$10,570,000,000.
15	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
16	ments, \$6,709,000,000.
17	(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
18	Fiscal year 1997:
19	(A) New budget authority, \$8,100,000,000.
20	(B) Outlays, -\$2,400,000,000.
21	(C) New direct loan obligations,
22	\$1,856,000,000.
23	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
24	ments, \$197,340,000,000.
25	Fiscal year 1998:

1	(A) New budget authority, \$9,600,000,000.
2	(B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.
3	(C) New direct loan obligations,
4	\$1,787,000,000.
5	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
6	ments, \$196,750,000,000.
7	Fiscal year 1999:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$6,100,000,000.
10	(C) New direct loan obligations,
11	\$1,763,000,000.
12	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
13	ments, \$196,253,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 2000:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$7,500,000,000.
17	(C) New direct loan obligations,
18	\$1,759,000,000.
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
20	ments, \$195,883,000,000.
21	Fiscal year 2001:
22	(A) New budget authority, \$11,400,000,000.
23	(B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.
24	(C) New direct loan obligations,
25	\$1,745,000,000.

1	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
2	ments, \$195,375,000,000.
3	Fiscal year 2002:
4	(A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.
5	(B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.
6	(C) New direct loan obligations,
7	\$1,740,000,000.
8	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
9	ments, \$194,875,000,000.
10	(8) Transportation (400):
11	Fiscal year 1997:
12	(A) New budget authority, \$42,600,000,000.
13	(B) Outlays, \$39,300,000,000.
14	(C) New direct loan obligations,
15	\$15,000,000.
16	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
17	ments, \$0.
18	Fiscal year 1998:
19	(A) New budget authority, \$43,300,000,000.
20	(B) Outlays, \$37,000,000,000.
21	(C) New direct loan obligations,
22	\$15,000,000.
23	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
24	ments, \$0.
25	Fiscal year 1999:

1	(A) New budget authority, \$43,800,000,000.
2	(B) Outlays, \$35,600,000,000.
3	(C) New direct loan obligations,
4	\$15,000,000.
5	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
6	ments, \$0.
7	Fiscal year 2000:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$43,500,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$34,100,000,000.
10	(C) New direct loan obligations,
11	\$15,000,000.
12	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
13	ments, \$0.
14	Fiscal year 2001:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$43,700,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$33,700,000,000.
17	(C) New direct loan obligations,
18	\$15,000,000
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
20	ments, \$0.
21	Fiscal year 2002:
22	(A) New budget authority, \$44,000,000.
23	(B) Outlays, \$33,200,000,000.
24	(C) New direct loan obligations,
25	\$15,000,000.

1	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
2	ments, \$0.
3	(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
4	Fiscal year 1997:
5	(A) New budget authority, \$9,900,000,000.
6	(B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.
7	(C) New direct loan obligations,
8	\$1,222,000,000.
9	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
10	ments, \$2,133,000,000.
11	Fiscal year 1998:
12	(A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
13	(B) Outlays, \$9,500,000,000.
14	(C) New direct loan obligations,
15	\$1,242,000,000.
16	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
17	ments, \$2,133,000,000.
18	Fiscal year 1999:
19	(A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
20	(B) Outlays, \$8,600,000,000.
21	(C) New direct loan obligations,
22	\$1,265,000,000.
23	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
24	ments, \$2,171,000,000.
25	Fiscal year 2000:

1	(A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
2	(B) Outlays, \$7,700,000,000.
3	(C) New direct loan obligations,
4	\$1,288,000,000.
5	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
6	ments, \$2,171,000,000.
7	Fiscal year 2001:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$7,200,000,000.
10	(C) New direct loan obligations,
11	\$1,317,000,000.
12	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
13	ments, \$2,202,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 2002:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$6,600,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$6,700,000,000.
17	(C) New direct loan obligations,
18	\$1,343,000,000.
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
20	ments, \$2,202,000,000.
21	(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social
22	Services (500):
23	Fiscal year 1997:
24	(A) New budget authority, \$51,400,000,000.
25	(B) Outlays, \$51,500,000,000.

1	(C) New direct loan obligations,
2	\$16,219,000,000.
3	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
4	ments, \$15,469,000,000.
5	Fiscal year 1998:
6	(A) New budget authority, \$49,000,000,000.
7	(B) Outlays, \$48,900,000,000.
8	(C) New direct loan obligations,
9	\$19,040,000,000.
10	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
11	ments, \$14,760,000,000.
12	Fiscal year 1999:
13	(A) New budget authority, \$50,200,000,000.
14	(B) Outlays, \$49,400,000,000.
15	(C) New direct loan obligations,
16	\$21,781,000,000.
17	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
18	ments, \$13,854,000,000.
19	Fiscal year 2000:
20	(A) New budget authority, \$51,000,000,000.
21	(B) Outlays, \$50,200,000,000.
22	(C) New direct loan obligations,
23	\$22,884,000,000.
24	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
25	ments, \$14,589,000,000.

1	Fiscal year 2001:
2	(A) New budget authority, \$51,800,000,000
3	(B) Outlays, \$50,900,000,000.
4	(C) New direct loan obligations,
5	\$23,978,000,000.
6	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
7	ments, \$15,319,000,000.
8	Fiscal year 2002:
9	(A) New budget authority, \$52,600,000,000
10	(B) Outlays, \$51,700,000,000.
11	(C) New direct loan obligations,
12	\$25,127,000,000.
13	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
14	ments, \$16,085,000,000.
15	(11) Health (550):
16	Fiscal year 1997:
17	(A) New budget authority,
18	\$131,400,000,000.
19	(B) Outlays, \$132,400,000,000.
20	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
21	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
22	ments, \$187,000,000.
23	Fiscal year 1998:
24	(A) New budget authority,
25	\$137,400,000,000.

1	(B) Outlays, \$137,800,000,000.
2	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
3	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
4	ments, \$94,000,000.
5	Fiscal year 1999:
6	(A) New budget authority,
7	\$144,000,000,000.
8	(B) Outlays, \$144,100,000,000.
9	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
10	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
11	ments, \$0.
12	Fiscal year 2000:
13	(A) New budget authority,
14	\$152,800,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, \$152,700,000,000.
16	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
17	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
18	ments, \$0.
19	Fiscal year 2001:
20	(A) New budget authority,
21	\$160,300,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$159,900,000,000.
23	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
24	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
25	ments, \$0.

```
1
             Fiscal year 2002:
 2
                            New
                  (A)
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
 3
              $167,200,000,000.
 4
                  (B) Outlays, $166,700,000,000.
 5
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
 6
 7
             ments, $0.
 8
         (12) Medicare (570):
 9
             Fiscal year 1997:
10
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
11
              $193,200,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, $191,500,000,000.
12
13
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
14
15
             ments, $0.
             Fiscal year 1998:
16
17
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
18
              $205,900,000,000.
19
                  (B) Outlays, $204,200,000,000.
20
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
21
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
22
             ments, $0.
23
             Fiscal year 1999:
24
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
25
             $216,700,000,000.
```

1	(B) Outlays, \$214,400,000,000.
2	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
3	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
4	ments, \$0.
5	Fiscal year 2000:
6	(A) New budget authority,
7	\$227,300,000,000.
8	(B) Outlays, \$225,600,000,000.
9	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
10	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
11	ments, \$0.
12	Fiscal year 2001:
13	(A) New budget authority,
14	\$239,300,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, \$237,600,000,000.
16	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
17	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
18	ments, \$0.
19	Fiscal year 2002:
20	(A) New budget authority,
21	\$253,500,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$251,100,000,000.
23	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
24	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
25	ments, \$0.

```
(13) Income Security (600):
 1
 2
             Fiscal year 1997:
 3
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
 4
              $232,400,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, $240,300,000,000.
 5
 6
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
 7
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
 8
             ments, $0.
 9
             Fiscal year 1998:
10
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
11
              $241,900,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, $245,200,000,000.
12
13
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
14
15
             ments, $0.
16
             Fiscal year 1999:
17
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
18
              $246,500,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, $253,000,000,000.
19
20
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
21
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
22
             ments, $0.
23
             Fiscal year 2000:
                            New
24
                  (A)
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
25
             $264,600,000,000.
```

1	(B) Outlays, \$264,500,000,000.
2	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
3	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
4	ments, \$0.
5	Fiscal year 2001:
6	(A) New budget authority,
7	\$264,100,000,000.
8	(B) Outlays, \$268,500,000,000.
9	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
10	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
11	ments, \$0.
12	Fiscal year 2002:
13	(A) New budget authority,
14	\$282,800,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, \$281,100,000,000.
16	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
17	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
18	ments, \$0.
19	(14) Social Security (650):
20	Fiscal year 1997:
21	(A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$10,500,000,000.
23	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
24	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
25	ments, \$0.

1	Fiscal year 1998:
2	(A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.
3	(B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.
4	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
5	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
6	ments, \$0.
7	Fiscal year 1999:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$9,200,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.
10	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
11	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
12	ments, \$0.
13	Fiscal year 2000:
14	(A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, \$12,700,000,000.
16	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
17	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
18	ments, \$0.
19	Fiscal year 2001:
20	(A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.
21	(B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.
22	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
23	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
24	ments, \$0.
25	Fiscal year 2002:

1	(A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.
2	(B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.
3	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
4	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
5	ments, \$0.
6	(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
7	Fiscal year 1997:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$39,000,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$39,500,000,000.
10	(C) New direct loan obligations,
11	\$935,000,000.
12	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
13	ments, \$26,362,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 1998:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$38,600,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$39,300,000,000.
17	(C) New direct loan obligations,
18	\$962,000,000.
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
20	ments, \$25,925,000,000.
21	Fiscal year 1999:
22	(A) New budget authority, \$38,700,000,000.
23	(B) Outlays, \$39,300,000,000.
24	(C) New direct loan obligations,
25	\$987,000,000.

1	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
2	ments, \$25,426,000,000.
3	Fiscal year 2000:
4	(A) New budget authority, \$38,700,000,000.
5	(B) Outlays, \$40,400,000,000.
6	(C) New direct loan obligations,
7	\$1,021,000,000.
8	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
9	ments, \$24,883,000,000.
10	Fiscal year 2001:
11	(A) New budget authority, \$38,800,000,000.
12	(B) Outlays, \$37,700,000,000.
13	(C) New direct loan obligations,
14	\$1,189,000,000.
15	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
16	ments, \$24,298,000,000.
17	Fiscal year 2002:
18	(A) New budget authority, \$39,000,000,000.
19	(B) Outlays, \$39,300,000,000.
20	(C) New direct loan obligations,
21	\$1,194,000,000.
22	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
23	ments, \$23,668,000,000.
24	(16) Administration of Justice (750):
25	Fiscal year 1997:

1	(A) New budget authority, \$21,700,000,000.
2	(B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.
3	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
4	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
5	ments, \$0.
6	Fiscal year 1998:
7	(A) New budget authority, \$22,300,000,000.
8	(B) Outlays, \$21,600,000,000.
9	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
10	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
11	ments, \$0.
12	Fiscal year 1999:
13	(A) New budget authority, \$23,300,000,000.
14	(B) Outlays, \$22,400,000,000.
15	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
16	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
17	ments, \$0.
18	Fiscal year 2000:
19	(A) New budget authority, \$23,300,000,000.
20	(B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.
21	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
22	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
23	ments, \$0.
24	Fiscal year 2001:
25	(A) New budget authority, \$19,900,000,000.

1	(B) Outlays, \$19,800,000,000.
2	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
3	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
4	ments, \$0.
5	Fiscal year 2002:
6	(A) New budget authority, \$19,900,000,000.
7	(B) Outlays, \$19,800,000,000.
8	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
9	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
10	ments, \$0.
11	(17) General Government (800):
12	Fiscal year 1997:
13	(A) New budget authority, \$13,800,000,000.
14	(B) Outlays, \$13,700,000,000.
15	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
16	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
17	ments, \$0.
18	Fiscal year 1998:
19	(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.
20	(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.
21	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
22	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
23	ments, \$0.
24	Fiscal year 1999:
25	(A) New budget authority \$13,300,000,000.

1	(B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.
2	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
3	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
4	ments, \$0.
5	Fiscal year 2000:
6	(A) New budget authority, \$13,200,000,000.
7	(B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.
8	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
9	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
10	ments, \$0.
11	Fiscal year 2001:
12	(A) New budget authority, \$13,300,000,000.
13	(B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.
14	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
15	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
16	ments, \$0.
17	Fiscal year 2002:
18	(A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
19	(B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.
20	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
21	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
22	ments, \$0.
23	(18) Net Interest (900):
24	Fiscal uear 1997:

1	(A) New budget authority
2	\$282,800,000,000.
3	(B) Outlays, \$282,800,000,000.
4	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
5	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit
6	ments, \$0.
7	Fiscal year 1998:
8	(A) New budget authority
9	\$289,400,000,000.
10	(B) Outlays, \$289,400,000,000.
11	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
12	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit
13	ments, \$0.
14	Fiscal year 1999:
15	(A) New budget authority
16	\$293,200,000,000.
17	(B) Outlays, \$293,200,000,000.
18	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
19	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit
20	ments, \$0.
21	Fiscal year 2000:
22	(A) New budget authority
23	\$294,700,000,000.
24	(B) Outlays, \$294,700,000,000.
25	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

```
(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
 1
 2
              ments, $0.
 3
              Fiscal year 2001:
 4
                   (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                     authority,
 5
              $298,900,000,000.
 6
                   (B) Outlays, $298,900,000,000.
 7
                   (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
 8
                   (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
 9
              ments, $0.
10
              Fiscal year 2002:
11
                   (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                     authority,
12
              $303,400,000,000.
13
                   (B) Outlays, $303,400,000,000.
14
                   (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
15
                   (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
              ments, $0.
16
17
         (19) The corresponding levels of gross interest on the
   public debt are as follows:
18
19
              Fiscal year 1997: $348,234,000,000.
20
              Fiscal year 1998: $351,240,000,000.
21
              Fiscal year 1999: $348,465,000,000.
22
              Fiscal year 2000: $349,951,000,000.
23
              Fiscal year 2001: $351,311,000,000.
24
              Fiscal year 2002: $352,756,000,000.
25
         (20) Allowances (920):
```

```
1
             Fiscal year 1997:
 2
                            New
                  (A)
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
 3
              -\$1,600,000,000.
 4
                  (B) Outlays, $800,000,000.
 5
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
 6
 7
             ments, $0.
 8
             Fiscal year 1998:
                  (A) New budget authority, -$200,000,000.
 9
10
                  (B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
11
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
12
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
13
             ments, $0.
14
             Fiscal year 1999:
                  (A) New budget authority, -\$400,000,000.
15
                  (B) Outlays, -\$300,000,000.
16
17
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
18
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
19
             ments, $0.
20
             Fiscal year 2000:
                  (A) New budget authority, -\$800,000,000.
21
                  (B) Outlays, -\$500,000,000.
22
23
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
24
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
25
             ments, $0.
```

```
1
             Fiscal year 2001:
 2
                            New
                                       budget
                  (A)
                                                    authority,
 3
              -\$1,200,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, -\$1,100,000,000.
 4
 5
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
 6
 7
             ments, $0.
 8
             Fiscal year 2002:
 9
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
10
              -\$3,700,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, -\$3,700,000,000.
11
12
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
13
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
14
             ments, $0.
15
         (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
16
             Fiscal year 1997:
17
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
18
              -\$43,700,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, -\$43,700,000,000.
19
20
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
21
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
22
             ments, $0.
23
             Fiscal year 1998:
24
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
25
              -\$35,700,000,000.
```

```
(B) Outlays, -\$35,700,000,000.
 1
 2
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
 3
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
 4
             ments, $0.
 5
             Fiscal year 1999:
 6
                  (A)
                            New
                                      budget
                                                    authority,
              -\$34,900,000,000.
 7
                  (B) Outlays, -\$34,900,000,000.
 8
 9
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
10
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
11
             ments, $0.
12
             Fiscal year 2000:
13
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
14
              -$36,700,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, -\$36,700,000,000.
15
16
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
17
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
18
             ments, $0.
19
             Fiscal year 2001:
20
                  (A)
                            New
                                      budget
                                                    authority,
              -$38,500,000,000.
21
                  (B) Outlays, -\$38,500,000,000.
22
23
                  (C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
24
                  (D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
25
             ments, $0.
```

1	Fiscal year 2002:
2	(A) New budget authority,
3	<i>−\$40,100,000,000</i> .
4	(B) Outlays, $-\$40,100,000,000$.
5	(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
6	(D) New primary loan guarantee commit-
7	ments, \$0.
8	SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION.
9	(a) First Reconciliation of Spending Reduc-
10	TIONS.—
11	(1) Senate committees.—Not later than June
12	14, 1996, the committees named in this subsection
13	shall submit their recommendations to the Committee
14	on the Budget of the Senate. After receiving those rec-
15	ommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall re-
16	port to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out
17	all such recommendations without any substantive re-
18	vision.
19	(A) Committee on agriculture, nutri-
20	TION, AND FORESTRY.—The Senate Committee
21	on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall re-
22	port changes in laws within its jurisdiction that
23	provide direct spending (as defined in section
24	250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emer-
25	gency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce out-

1	lays \$1,994,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and
2	\$29,376,000,000 for the period of fiscal years
3	1997 through 2002.
4	(B) Committee on finance.—The Senate
5	Committee on Finance shall report changes in
6	laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct
7	spending (as defined in section $250(c)(8)$ of the
8	Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control
9	Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$95,402,000,000
10	for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
11	(b) Final Reconciliation of Spending Reduc-
12	TIONS.—
13	(1) Senate committees.—If legislation is en-
14	acted pursuant to subsection (a), then no later than
15	July 12, 1996, the committees named in this sub-
16	section shall submit their recommendations to the
17	Committee on the Budget of the Senate. After receiv-

(A) Committee on agriculture, nutrition, and Forestry shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that

ing those recommendations, the Committee on the

Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill

carrying out all such recommendations without any

substantive revision.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$86,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$251,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
 - (B) Committee on Armed Services.—The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$79,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$649,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
 - (C) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$3,628,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$3,605,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

- (D) Committee on commerce, science, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in sec-tion 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to re-duce outlays \$0 in fiscal year 1997 and \$19,396,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
 - (E) Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$84,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$1,433,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
 - (F) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit

- 1 Control Act of1985) toreduceoutlays 2 \$87,000,000 infiscal 1997 and year \$2,212,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 3 4 through 2002.
 - (G) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$6,716,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$169,707,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
 - (H) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AF-FAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$955,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$8,789,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
 - (I) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce out-

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- lays \$0 in fiscal year 1997 and \$476,000,000 for
 the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
 - (J) Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$725,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$3,097,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
 - (K) Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$175,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$5,198,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS.—

(1) Senate committee.—If the legislation is enacted pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), then no later than September 18, 1996, the Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill

- 1 proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction nec-
- 2 essary to reduce revenues by not more than
- 3 \$15,359,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and
- 4 \$116,104,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997
- 5 through 2002 and reduce outlays \$1,692,000,000 in
- 6 fiscal year 1997 and \$11,524,000,000 for the period
- 7 of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.
- 8 (d) Treatment of Reconciliation Bills for
- 9 Prior Surplus.—For purposes of section 202 of House
- 10 Concurrent Resolution 67 (104th Congress), legislation
- 11 which reduces revenues pursuant to a reconciliation in-
- 12 struction contained in subsection (c) shall be taken together
- 13 with all other legislation enacted pursuant to the reconcili-
- 14 ation instructions contained in this resolution when deter-
- 15 mining the deficit effect of such legislation.

16 TITLE II—BUDGETARY

17 RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

- 18 SEC. 201. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.
- 19 (a) DEFINITION.—As used in this section and for the
- 20 purposes of allocations made pursuant to section 302(a) or
- 21 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the dis-
- 22 cretionary category, the term "discretionary spending
- 23 limit" means—
- 24 (1) with respect to fiscal year 1997—

1	(A) for the defense category
2	\$266,362,000,000 in new budget authority and
3	\$264,568,000,000 in outlays; and
4	(B) for the nondefense category
5	\$227,845,000,000 in new budget authority and
6	\$270,923,000,000 in outlays;
7	(2) with respect to fiscal year 1998—
8	(A) for the defense category
9	\$267,831,000,000 in new budget authority and
10	\$262,962,000,000 in outlays; and
11	(B) for the nondefense category
12	\$221,322,000,000 in new budget authority and
13	\$258,698,000,000 in outlays;
14	(3) with respect to fiscal year 1999, for the dis-
15	cretionary category \$493,221,000,000 in new budget
16	authority and \$525,742,000,000 in outlays;
17	(4) with respect to fiscal year 2000, for the dis-
18	cretionary category \$500,037,000,000 in new budget
19	authority and \$525,071,000,000 in outlays;
20	(5) with respect to fiscal year 2001, for the dis-
21	cretionary category \$492,468,000,000 in new budget
22	authority and \$517,708,000,000 in outlays; and
23	(6) with respect to fiscal year 2002, for the dis-
24	cretionary category \$501,177,000,000 in new budget
25	authority and \$515,979,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted for changes in concepts and definitions and emergency appropriations. 3 (b) Point of Order in the Senate.— 4 (1) In general.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to 5 6 consider— 7 (A) a revision of this resolution or any con-8 current resolution on the budget for fiscal year 9 1998 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides discre-10 11 tionary spending in excess of the sum of the de-12 fense and nondefense discretionary spending lim-13 its for such fiscal year; 14 (B) any concurrent resolution on the budget 15 for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 (or 16 amendment, motion, or conference report on such 17 a resolution) that provides discretionary spend-18 ing in excess of the discretionary spending limit 19 for such fiscal year; or 20 (C) any appropriations bill or resolution 21 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on 22 such appropriations bill or resolution) for fiscal 23 year 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that 24 would exceed any of the discretionary spending

limits in this section or suballocations of those

limits made pursuant to section 602(b) of the
 Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Exception.—

3

4

5

6

7

- (A) In General.—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by the Congress is in effect or if a joint resolution pursuant to section 258 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 has been enacted.
- 9 (B) Enforcement of discretionary lim10 Its in fy 1997.—Until the enactment of rec11 onciliation legislation pursuant to subsections
 12 (a) and (b) of section 105 of this resolution and
 13 for purposes of the application of paragraph (1),
 14 only subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) shall
 15 apply to fiscal year 1997.
- 16 (c) Waiver.—This section may be waived or sus-17 pended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-18 fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.
- (d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the deci-20 sions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section 21 shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, 22 and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the 23 concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case 24 may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members 25 of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in

- 1 the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair
- 2 on a point of order raised under this section.
- 3 (e) Determination of Budget Levels.—For pur-
- 4 poses of this section, the levels of new budget authority, out-
- 5 lays, new entitlement authority, and revenues for a fiscal
- 6 year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by
- 7 the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.
- 8 SEC. 202. TAX RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.
- 9 (a) In General.—In the Senate, revenue and spend-
- 10 ing aggregates may be reduced and allocations may be re-
- 11 vised for legislation that reduces revenues by providing fam-
- 12 ily tax relief, fuel tax relief, and incentives to stimulate sav-
- 13 ings, investment, job creation, and economic growth if such
- 14 legislation will not increase the deficit for—
- 15 (1) fiscal year 1997;
- 16 (2) the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2001;
- 17 *or*
- 18 (3) the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.
- 19 (b) Revised Allocations.—Upon the consideration
- 20 of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of
- 21 the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with
- 22 the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections
- 23 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974
- 24 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out
- 25 this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and

1	aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Con-
2	gressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional lev-
3	els, and aggregates contained in this resolution.
4	(c) Reporting Revised Allocations.—The appro-
5	priate committee shall report appropriately revised alloca-
6	tions pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congres-
7	sional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.
8	SEC. 203. SUPERFUND RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.
9	(a) In General.—After the enactment of legislation
10	that reforms the Superfund program and extends
11	Superfund taxes, in the Senate, budget authority and out-
12	lays allocated to the Committee on Appropriations under
13	sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act
14	of 1974, the appropriate functional levels, the appropriate
15	budget aggregates, and the discretionary spending limits in
16	section 201 of this resolution may be revised to provide ad-
17	ditional budget authority and the outlays flowing from that
18	budget authority for the Superfund program, pursuant to
19	this section.
20	(b) Deficit Neutral Adjustments.—
21	(1) Allocations.—
22	(A) Committee allocations.—In the Sen-
23	ate, upon reporting of an appropriations meas-
24	ure, or when a conference committee submits a
25	conference report thereon, that appropriates

funds for the Superfund program in excess of \$1,302,000,000, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit revised allocations, functional levels, budget aggregates, and discretionary spending limits to carry out this section that adds to such allocations, levels, aggregates, and limits an amount that is equal to such excess. These revised allocations, levels, aggregates, and limits shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations, levels, aggregates, and limits contained in this resolution.

- (B) Committee Suballocations.—The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 following the revision of the allocations pursuant to subparagraph (A).
- (2) Limitations.—The adjustments under this subsection shall not exceed—
 - (A) the net revenue increase for a fiscal year resulting from the enactment of legislation that extends Superfund taxes; and

1	(B) $$898,000,000$ in budget authority for a
2	fiscal year and the outlays flowing from such
3	budget authority in all fiscal years.
4	SEC. 204. SCORING OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.
5	Notwithstanding section $606(d)(2)$ of the Congressional
6	Budget Act of 1974, the determinations under sections 302,
7	303, 311, and 602 of such Act shall take into account any
8	new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays,
9	receipts, or deficit effects as a consequence of the provisions
10	of sections 251(b)(2)(D) and 252(e) of the Balanced Budget
11	and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.
12	SEC. 205. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.
13	The Congress adopts the provisions of this title—
14	(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the
15	Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively,
16	and as such they shall be considered as part of the
17	rules of each House, or of that House to which they
18	specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede
19	other rules only to the extent that they are inconsist-
20	ent therewith; and
21	(2) with full recognition of the constitutional
22	right of either House to change those rules (so far as
23	they relate to that House) at any time, in the same
24	manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any
25	other rule of that House.

1	TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CON-
2	GRESS, HOUSE OF REP-
3	RESENTATIVES, AND SENATE
4	SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON SALE OF GOVERN-
5	MENT ASSETS.
6	(a) Sense of the Congress.—It is the sense of the
7	Congress that—
8	(1) the prohibition on scoring asset sales has dis-
9	couraged the sale of assets that can be better managed
10	by the private sector and generate receipts to reduce
11	the Federal budget deficit;
12	(2) the President's fiscal year 1997 budget in-
13	cluded \$3,900,000,000 in receipts from asset sales and
14	proposed a change in the asset sale scoring rule to
15	allow the proceeds from these sales to be scored;
16	(3) assets should not be sold if such sale would
17	increase the budget deficit over the long run; and
18	(4) the asset sale scoring prohibition should be
19	repealed and consideration should be given to replac-
20	ing it with a methodology that takes into account the
21	long-term budgetary impact of asset sales.
22	(b) Definitions.—For purposes of this section, the
23	term "sale of an asset" shall have the same meaning as
24	under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emer-
25	gency Deficit Control Act of 1985

1	SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT TAX REDUC-
2	TIONS SHOULD BENEFIT WORKING FAMILIES.
3	It is the sense of the Congress that this concurrent reso-
4	lution on the budget assumes any reductions in taxes should
5	be structured to benefit working families by providing fam-
6	ily tax relief and incentives to stimulate savings, invest-
7	ment, job creation, and economic growth.
8	SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON A BIPARTISAN COM-
9	MISSION ON THE SOLVENCY OF MEDICARE.
10	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
11	(1) the Trustees of medicare have concluded that
12	"the medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its
13	present form";
14	(2) the Trustees of medicare concluded in 1995
15	that "the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which pays
16	inpatient hospital expenses, will be able to pay bene-
17	fits for only about 7 years and is severely out of fi-
18	nancial balance in the long range";
19	(3) preliminary data made available to the Con-
20	gress indicate that the Hospital Trust Fund will go
21	bankrupt in the year 2001, rather than the year 2002,
22	as predicted last year;
23	(4) the Public Trustees of medicare have con-
24	cluded that "the Supplementary Medical Insurance
25	Trust Fund shows a rate of growth of costs which is
26	clearly unsustainable";

- 1 (5) the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement 2 and Tax Reform concluded that, absent long-term 3 changes in medicare, projected medicare outlays will 4 increase from about 4 percent of the payroll tax base 5 today to over 15 percent of the payroll tax base by 6 the year 2030; 7 (6) the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement
 - (6) the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform recommended, by a vote of 30 to 1, that spending and revenues available for medicare must be brought into long-term balance; and
 - (7) in the most recent Trustees' report, the Public Trustees of medicare "strongly recommend that the crisis presented by the financial condition of the medicare trust funds be urgently addressed on a comprehensive basis, including a review of the program's financing methods, benefit provisions, and delivery mechanisms."
- 18 (b) Sense of the Congress.—It is the sense of the 19 Congress that in order to meet the aggregates and levels in 20 this budget resolution—
- 21 (1) a special bipartisan commission should be es-22 tablished immediately to make recommendations con-23 cerning the most appropriate response to the short-24 term solvency and long-term sustainability issues fac-25 ing the medicare program; and

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1	(2) the commission should report to Congress its
2	recommendations prior to the adoption of a concur-
3	rent budget resolution for fiscal year 1998 in order
4	that the committees of jurisdiction may consider these
5	recommendations in fashioning an appropriate con-
6	gressional response.
7	SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONSIDERING A
8	CHANGE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE IN THE SEN-
9	ATE.
10	It is the sense of the Senate that—
11	(1) proposals to increase the minimum wage
12	have important economic and budgetary consequences,
13	as there are about 3,600,000 workers at or below the
14	minimum wage under current law, according to the
15	Congressional Budget Office ("CBO");
16	(2) S. 413, a bill to increase the minimum wage,
17	would increase costs for State and local governments
18	by \$1,030,000,000 over the period 1996 to 2000, ac-
19	cording to the CBO, and would, therefore, violate sec-
20	tion 425(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of
21	1974 regarding unfunded intergovernmental man-
22	dates;
23	(3) S. 413 would increase costs for the private
24	sector by \$12.300.000.000 over the period 1996 to

1	2000 and would reduce jobs by between 100,000 and
2	500,000, according to the CBO;
3	(4) increasing the minimum wage would have
4	significant interactions with other Federal spending
5	and tax programs, including welfare programs and
6	the earned income credit;
7	(5) States have the authority to increase the
8	minimum wage in their States, and, as of February
9	1996, 10 States, plus Puerto Rico and Washington,
10	D.C., had minimum wages above the Federal mini-
11	mum wage;
12	(6) although raising the minimum wage will in-
13	crease incomes for some workers, it is a poorly tar-
14	geted approach to helping poor and low-income fami-
15	lies because—
16	(A) it will eliminate jobs for some
17	minimum- and low-wage workers;
18	(B) 85 percent of workers in poor families
19	are paid more than the minimum wage, and
20	nearly 60 percent are paid more than \$5.25 per
21	hour, according to the CBO;
22	(C) most minimum wage workers are not
23	poor, with some 70 percent in households with
24	incomes above 150 percent of the poverty line,
25	according to the CBO; and

- 1 (D) most minimum wage workers do not 2 stay at the minimum wage very long, with two-3 thirds getting a pay raise within the first year, 4 according to the CBO;
 - (7) the best approach to increasing wages and incomes for working families is to promote policies that enhance economic growth and job creation, such as increasing net national savings and investment by balancing the Federal budget and promoting private savings and investment through fundamental tax reform;
 - (8) legislation to change the minimum wage should be considered in the Senate in an orderly manner as part of the regular consideration of matters related to the budget and the economy and not as an unscheduled amendment to unrelated legislation;
 - (9) there are important issues which should be considered in the same legislation and in conjunction with proposals to raise the minimum wage, such as allowing for improvements in the workplace by enabling cooperative efforts between labor and management as provided for in S. 295, the Team Work for Employees and Management Act of 1995, and maintaining a training wage to minimize job loss for new entrants into the job market; and

1	(10) the Senate should schedule consideration of
2	legislation that addresses in the same bill, as a single
3	proposal, the minimum wage and the provisions of S.
4	295 no later than the month of June 1996.
5	SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LONG-TERM PROJEC-
6	TIONS IN BUDGET ESTIMATES.
7	It is the sense of the Senate that—
8	(1) the report accompanying a concurrent resolu-
9	tion on the budget should include an analysis, pre-
10	pared after consultation with the Director of the Con-
11	gressional Budget Office, of the concurrent resolution's
12	impact on revenues and outlays for entitlements for
13	the period of 30 fiscal years; and
14	(2) the President should include in his budget
15	each year, an analysis of the budget's impact on reve-
16	nues and outlays for entitlements for the period of 30
17	fiscal years, and that the President should also in-
18	clude generational accounting information each year
19	in the President's budget.
20	SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON MEDICARE TRANS-
21	FERS.
22	(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—
23	(1) home health care provides a broad spectrum
24	of health and social services to approximately

- 1 3,500,000 medicare beneficiaries in the comfort of 2 their homes;
 - (2) the President has proposed reimbursing the first 100 home health care visits after a hospital stay through medicare part A and reimbursing all other visits through medicare part B, shifting responsibility for \$55,000,000,000 of spending from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to the general revenues that pay for medicare part B;
 - (3) such a transfer does nothing to control medicare spending, and is merely a bookkeeping change which artificially extends the solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund;
 - (4) this transfer of funds camouflages the need to make changes in the medicare program to ensure the long-term solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which the Congressional Budget Office now states will become bankrupt in the year 2001, a year earlier than projected in the 1995 report by the Trustees of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds;
 - (5) Congress will be breaking a commitment to the American people if it does not act to ensure the solvency of the entire medicare program in both the short- and long-term;

1	(6) the President's proposal would force those in
2	need of chronic care services to rely upon the avail-
3	ability of general revenues to provide financing for
4	these services, making them more vulnerable to bene-
5	fits changes than under current law; and
6	(7) according to the National Association of
7	Home Care, shifting medicare home care payments
8	from part A to part B would deemphasize the impor-
9	tance of home care by eliminating its status as part
10	of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, thereby under-
11	mining access to the less costly form of care.
12	(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress
13	that in meeting the spending targets specified in the budget
14	resolution, Congress should not accept the President's pro-
15	posal to transfer spending from one part of medicare to an-
16	other in its efforts to preserve, protect, and improve the
17	medicare program.
18	SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REPEAL OF THE GAS
19	TAX.
20	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
21	(1) the President originally proposed a
22	\$72,000,000,000 energy excise tax (the so-called BTU
23	tax) as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation
24	Act of 1993 (OBRA 93) which included a new tax on
25	$transportation\ fuels;$

- 1 (2) in response to opposition in the Senate to the 2 BTU tax, the President and the Congress adopted in-3 stead a new 4.3 cents per gallon transportation fuels 4 tax as part of OBRA 93, which represented a 30 per-5 cent increase in the existing motor fuels tax;
 - (3) the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax has cost American motorists an estimated \$14,000,000,000 to \$15,000,000,000 since it went into effect on October 1, 1993;
 - (4) the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax is regressive, creating a larger financial impact on lower and middle income motorists than on upper income motorists;
 - (5) the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax imposes a disproportionate burden on rural citizens who do not have access to public transportation services, and who must rely on their automobiles and drive long distances, to work, to shop, and to receive medical care;
 - (6) the average American faces a substantial tax burden, and the increase of this tax burden through the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax represented and continues to represent an inappropriate and unwarranted means of reducing the Nation's budget deficit:

- 1 (7) retail gasoline prices in the United States 2 have increased an average of 19 cents per gallon since 3 the beginning of the year to the highest level since the Persian Gulf War, and the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax exacerbates the impact of this price increase 5 6 on consumers: 7 (8) continuation of the OBRA 93 transportation 8 fuels tax will exacerbate the impact on consumers of 9 any future gasoline price spikes that result from mar-10 ket conditions: and 11 (9) the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution will as-12 sume a net tax cut totaling \$122,000,000,000 over six 13 years, which exceeds the revenue impact of a repeal 14 of the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax, and will es-15 tablish a reserve fund which may be used to provide 16 other forms of tax relief, including relief from the 17 OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax, on a deficit neu-18 tral basis.
- 19 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-20 ate that the revenue levels and procedures in this resolution 21 provide that—
- 22 (1) the Congress and the President should imme-23 diately approve legislation to repeal the 4.3 cents per 24 gallon transportation fuels tax contained in the Om-

1	nibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 through the
2	end of 1996;
3	(2) the Congress and the President should ap-
4	prove, through the fiscal year 1997 budget process,
5	legislation to permanently repeal the 4.3 cents per
6	gallon transportation fuels tax contained in the Om-
7	nibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993; and
8	(3) the savings generated by the repeal of the 4.3
9	cents per gallon transportation fuels tax contained in
10	OBRA 93 should be fully passed on to consumers.
11	SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MEDICARE TRUSTEES
12	REPORT.
13	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
14	(1) the Trustees of the Medicare Hospital Insur-
15	ance (HI) Trust Fund serve as fiduciaries for one of
16	the Federal Government's most important programs,
17	and as fiduciaries provide critically important infor-
18	mation each year to the Congress and the public on
19	the financial status of the Medicare HI Fund;
20	(2) the Trustees are required to issue a report on
21	the financial status of the medicare HI Trust Fund
22	by April 1 of each year;
23	(3) the April 1995 Trustees Report stated that
24	the Medicare HI Trust Fund would go bankrupt in
25	the year 2002, but in 1995 the Congress and the

1	President could not agree on a plan to extend the sol-
2	vency of the medicare program;
3	(4) in 1996, the Congress and the public require
4	timely information on the full and exact nature of
5	medicare's financial condition in order to understand
6	what actions must be taken to extend the solvency of
7	the of the Medicare HI Trust Fund; and
8	(5) despite the April 1 deadline, the 1996 Medi-
9	care Trustees Report has not yet been issued, and
10	each day of delay further jeopardizes Congress' ability
11	to respond appropriately to forestall the program's
12	bankruptcy.
13	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
14	ate that the levels in this budget resolution assume that—
15	(1) the Medicare Trustees should discharge their
16	fiduciary and statutory responsibilities and issue
17	their 1996 report as soon as possible; and
18	(2) in light of the Trustees' delay thus far, the
19	Chief Actuary of the Medicare Trust Fund should
20	share with Congress immediately any preliminary in-
21	formation on the current financial status of the Trust
22	Fund.

1	SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING CHANGES
2	IN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.
3	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, in achieving the
4	spending levels specified in this resolution—
5	(1) the public trustees of medicare have con-
6	cluded that "the medicare program is clearly
7	unsustainable in its present form";
8	(2) the President has said his goal is to keep the
9	medicare hospital insurance trust fund solvent for
10	more than a decade, but his budget transfers
11	\$55,000,000,000 of home health spending from medi-
12	care part A to medicare part B;
13	(3) the transfer of home health spending threat-
14	ens the delivery of home health services to 3.5 million
15	medicare beneficiaries;
16	(4) such a transfer increases the burden on gen-
17	eral revenues, including income taxes paid by work-
18	ing Americans, by \$55,000,000,000;
19	(5) such a transfer artificially inflates the sol-
20	vency of the medicare hospital insurance trust fund,
21	misleading the Congress, medicare beneficiaries, and
22	working taxpayers;
23	(6) the Director of the Congressional Budget Of-
24	fice has certified that, without such a transfer, the
25	President's budget extends the solvency of the hospital

1	insurance trust fund for only one additional year,
2	and
3	(7) without misleading transfers, the President's
4	budget therefore fails to achieve his own stated goal
5	for the medicare hospital insurance trust fund.
6	(b) Sense of the Congress.—It is the sense of the
7	Congress that, in achieving the spending levels specified in
8	this resolution, the Congress assumes that the Congress
9	would—
10	(1) keep the medicare hospital insurance trust
11	fund solvent for more than a decade, as recommended
12	by the President; and
13	(2) accept the President's proposed level of medi-
14	care part B savings of \$44,100,000,000 over the pe-
15	riod 1997 through 2002; but would
16	(3) reject the President's proposal to transfer
17	home health spending from one part of medicare to
18	another, which threatens the delivery of home health
19	care services to 3.5 million medicare beneficiaries, ar-
20	tificially inflates the solvency of the medicare hospital
21	insurance trust fund, and increases the burden on
22	general revenues, including income taxes paid by
23	working Americans, by \$55,000,000,000.

1 SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING TO ASSIST 2 YOUTH AT RISK. 3 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that— 4 (1) there is an increasing prevalence of violence 5 and drug use among this country's youth; 6 (2) recognizing the magnitude of this problem 7 the Federal Government must continue to maximize 8 efforts in addressing the increasing prevalence of vio-9 lence and drug use among this country's youth, with 10 necessary adherence to budget guidelines; 11 (3) the Federal Bureau of Investigation reports 12 that between 1985 and 1994, juvenile arrests for vio-13 lent crime increased by 75 percent nationwide; 14 (4) the United States Attorney General reports 15 that 20 years ago, fewer than half our cities reported 16 gang activity and now, a generation later, reasonable 17 estimates indicate that there are more than 500,000 18 gang members in more than 16,000 gangs on the 19 streets of our cities resulting in more than 580,000 20 gang-related crimes in 1993; 21 (5) the Justice Department's Office of Juvenile 22 Justice and Delinquency Prevention reports that in 23 1994, law enforcement agencies made over 2,700,000 24 arrests of persons under age 18, with juveniles ac-25 counting for 19 percent of all violent crime arrests

across the country;

1	(6) the Congressional Task Force on National
2	Drug Policy recently set forth a series of recommenda-
3	tions for strengthening the criminal justice and law
4	enforcement effort, including domestic prevention ef-
5	forts reinforcing the idea that prevention begins at
6	home;
7	(7) the Office of National Drug Control Policy
8	reports that between 1991 and 1995, marijuana use
9	among 8th, 10th, and 12th graders has increased and
10	is continuing to spiral upward; and
11	(8) the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention
12	reports that in 1993, substance abuse played a role in
13	over 70 percent of rapes, over 60 percent of incidents
14	of child abuse, and almost 60 percent of murders na-
15	tionwide.
16	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
17	ate that the functional totals underlying this concurrent res-
18	olution on the budget assume that—
19	(1) sufficient funding should be provided to pro-
20	grams which assist youth at risk to reduce illegal
21	drug use and the incidence of youth crime and vio-
22	lence;
23	(2) priority should be given to determine "what
24	works" through scientifically recognized, independent

1	evaluations of existing programs to maximize the
2	Federal investment; and
3	(3) efforts should be made to ensure coordination
4	and eliminate duplication among federally supported
5	at-risk youth programs.
6	SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE USE OF
7	BUDGETARY SAVINGS.
8	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
9	(1) in August of 1994, the Bipartisan Commis-
10	sion on Entitlement and Tax Reform issued an In-
11	terim Report to the President, which found that, "To
12	ensure that today's debt and spending commitments
13	do not unfairly burden America's children, the Gov-
14	ernment must act now. A bipartisan coalition of Con-
15	gress, led by the President, must resolve the long-term
16	imbalance between the Government's entitlement
17	promises and the funds it will have available to pay
18	for them";
19	(2) unless the Congress and the President act to-
20	gether in a bipartisan way, overall Federal spending
21	is projected by the Commission to rise from the cur-
22	rent level of slightly over 22 percent of the Gross Do-
23	mestic Product of the United States (hereafter in this
24	section referred as "GDP") to over 37 percent of GDP
25	by the year 2030;

1	(3) the source of that growth is not domestic dis-
2	cretionary spending, which is approximately the same
3	portion of GDP now as it was in 1969, the last time
4	at which the Federal budget was in balance;
5	(4) mandatory spending was only 29.6 percent
6	of the Federal budget in 1963, but is estimated to ac-
7	count for 72 percent of the Federal budget in the year
8	2003;
9	(5) social security, medicare and medicaid, to-
10	gether with interest on the national debt, are the larg-
11	est sources of the growth of mandatory spending;
12	(6) ensuring the long-term future of the social se-
13	curity system is essential to protecting the retirement
14	security of the American people;
15	(7) the Social Security Trust Fund is projected
16	to begin spending more than it takes in by approxi-
17	mately the year 2013, with Federal budget deficits
18	rising rapidly thereafter unless appropriate policy
19	changes are made;
20	(8) ensuring the future of medicare and medic-
21	aid is essential to protecting access to high-quality
22	health care for senior citizens and poor women and
23	children;
24	(9) Federal health care ernenses have been rising

at double digit rates, and are projected to triple to 11

1	percent of GDP by the year 2030 unless appropriate
2	policy changes are made; and
3	(10) due to demographic factors, Federal health
4	care expenses are projected to double by the year
5	2030, even if health care cost inflation is restrained
6	after 1999, so that costs for each person of a given age
7	grow no faster than the economy.
8	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
9	ate that budget savings in the mandatory spending area
10	should be used—
11	(1) to protect and enhance the retirement secu-
12	rity of the American people by ensuring the long-term
13	future of the social security system;
14	(2) to protect and enhance the health care secu-
15	rity of senior citizens and poor Americans by ensur-
16	ing the long-term future of medicare and medicaid;
17	and
18	(3) to restore and maintain Federal budget dis-
19	cipline, to ensure that the level of private investment
20	necessary for long-term economic growth and prosper-
21	ity is available.

1	SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE TRANS
2	FER OF EXCESS GOVERNMENT COMPUTERS
3	TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS.
4	(a) Assumptions.—The figures contained in this reso-
5	lution are based on the following assumptions:
6	(1) America's children must obtain the necessary
7	skills and tools needed to succeed in the techno-
8	logically advanced 21st century;
9	(2) Executive Order 12999 outlines the need to
10	make modern computer technology an integral part of
11	every classroom, provide teachers with the professional
12	development they need to use new technologies effec-
13	tively, connect classrooms to the National Information
14	Infrastructure, and encourage the creation of excellent
15	$education\ software;$
16	(3) many private corporations have donated edu-
17	cational software to schools, which are lacking the
18	necessary computer hardware to utilize this equip-
19	ment;
20	(4) current inventories of excess Federal Govern-
21	ment computers are being conducted in each Federal
22	agency; and
23	(5) there is no current communication being
24	made between Federal agencies with this excess equip-
25	ment and the schools in need of these computers.

1	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
2	ate that the functional totals and reconciliation instructions
3	in this budget resolution assume that the General Services
4	Administration should place a high priority on facilitating
5	direct transfer of excess Federal Government computers to
6	public schools and community-based educational organiza-
7	tions.
8	SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FEDERAL RETREATS.
9	It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions un-
10	derlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that
11	all Federal agencies will refrain from using Federal funds
12	for expenses incurred during training sessions or retreats
13	off of Federal property, unless Federal property is not
14	available.
15	SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ESSEN-
16	TIAL AIR SERVICE PROGRAM OF THE DEPART-
17	MENT OF TRANSPORTATION.
18	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
19	(1) the essential air service program of the De-
20	partment of Transportation under subchapter II of
21	chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code—
22	(A) provides essential airline access to iso-
23	lated rural communities across the United
24	States;

1	(B) is necessary for the economic growth
2	and development of rural communities;
3	(C) connects small rural communities to the
4	national air transportation system of the United
5	States;
6	(D) is a critical component of the national
7	transportation system of the United States; and
8	(E) provides air service to 108 communities
9	in 30 States; and
10	(2) the National Commission to Ensure a Strong
11	Competitive Airline Industry established under sec-
12	tion 204 of the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity,
13	Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation
14	Act of 1992 recommended maintaining the essential
15	air service program with a sufficient level of funding
16	to continue to provide air service to small commu-
17	nities.
18	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
19	ate that the essential air service program of the Department
20	of Transportation under subchapter II of chapter 417 of
21	title 49, United States Code, should receive a sufficient level
22	of funding to continue to provide air service to small rural
23	communities that qualify for assistance under the program.

1	SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EQUAL RE-
2	TIREMENT SAVINGS FOR HOMEMAKERS.
3	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that the assumptions
4	of this budget resolution take into account that—
5	(1) by teaching and feeding our children and
6	caring for our elderly, American homemakers are an
7	important, vital part of our society;
8	(2) homemakers retirement needs are the same as
9	all Americans, and thus they need every opportunity
10	to save and invest for retirement;
11	(3) because they are living on a single income,
12	homemakers and their spouses often have less income
13	for savings;
14	(4) individual retirement accounts are provided
15	by the Congress in the Internal Revenue Code to as-
16	sist Americans for retirement savings;
17	(5) currently, individual retirement accounts
18	permit workers other than homemakers to make de-
19	ductible contributions of \$2,000 a year, but limit
20	homemakers to deductible contributions of \$250 a
21	year;
22	(6) limiting homemakers individual retirement
23	account contributions to an amount less than the con-
24	tributions of other workers discriminates against
25	homemakers.

1	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
2	ate that the revenue level assumed in this budget resolution
3	provides for legislation to make individual retirement ac-
4	count deductible contribution limits for homemakers equal
5	to the individual retirement account deductible contribution
6	limits for all other American workers, and that the Congress
7	and the President should immediately approve such legisla-
8	tion in the appropriate reconciliation vehicle.
9	SEC. 316. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NA-
10	TIONAL INSTITUTE OF DRUG ABUSE.
11	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:
12	(1) The National Institute on Drug Abuse (here-
13	after referred to in this section as "NIDA") a part of
14	the National Institutes of Health (hereafter referred to
15	in this section as "NIH") supports over 85 percent of
16	the world's drug abuse research that has totally revo-
17	lutionized our understanding of addiction.
18	(2) One of NIDA's most significant areas of re-
19	search has been the identification of the
20	neurobiological bases of all aspects of addiction, in-
21	cluding craving.
22	(3) In 1993, NIDA announced that approval had
23	been granted by the Food and Drug Administration
24	of a new medication for the treatment of heroin and
25	other oniate addiction which breaks the addict of

- daily drug-seeking behavior and allows for greater
 compliance because the patient does not need to report
 to a clinic each day to have the medication administered.
 - (4) Among NIDA's most remarkable accomplishments of the past year is the successful immunization of animals against the psycho-stimulant effects of cocaine.
 - (5) NIDA has also recently announced that it is making substantial progress that is critical in directing their efforts to identify potential anti-cocaine medications. For example, NIDA researchers have recently shown that activation in the brain of one type of dopamine receptor suppresses drug-seeking behavior and relapse, whereas activation of another, triggers drug-seeking behavior.
 - (6) NIDA's efforts to speed up research to stem the tide of drug addition is in the best interest of all Americans.
 - (7) State and local governments spend billions of dollars to incarcerate persons who commit drug related offenses.
- 23 (8) A 1992 National Report by the Bureau of 24 Justice Statistics revealed that more than 3 out of 4 25 jail inmates reported drug use in their lifetime, more

- than 40 percent had used drugs in the month before their offense with 27 percent under the influence of drugs at the time of their offense. A significant number said they were trying to get money for drugs when they committed their crime.
 - (9) More than 60 percent of juveniles and young adults in State-operated juvenile institutions reported using drugs once a week or more for at least a month some time in the past, and almost 40 percent reported being under the influence of drugs at the time of their offense.
 - (10) This concurrent resolution proposes that budget authority for the NIH (including NIDA) be held constant at the fiscal year 1996 level of \$11,950,000,000 through fiscal year 2002.
 - (11) At such appropriation level, it would be impossible for NIH and NIDA to maintain research momentum through research project grants.
 - (12) Level funding for NIH in fiscal year 1997 would reduce the number of competing research project grants by nearly 500, from 6,620 in fiscal year 1996 to approximately 6,120 competing research project grants, reducing NIH's ability to maintain research momentum and to explore new ideas in research.

1	(13) NIH is the world's preeminent research in-
2	stitution dedicated to the support of science inspired
3	by and focused on the challenges of human illness and
4	health.
5	(14) NIH programs are instrumental in improv-
6	ing the quality of life for Americans through improv-
7	ing health and reducing monetary and personal costs
8	$of\ illnesses.$
9	(15) The discovery of an anti-addiction drug to
10	block the craving of illicit addictive substances will
11	benefit all of American society.
12	(b) Sense of the Congress.—It is the sense of the
13	Congress that amounts appropriated for the National Insti-
14	tutes of Health—
15	(1) for fiscal year 1997 should be increased by
16	a minimum of \$33,000,000;
17	(2) for fiscal year 1998 should be increased by
18	a minimum of \$67,000,000;
19	(3) for fiscal year 1999 should be increased by
20	a minimum of \$100,000,000;
21	(4) for fiscal year 2000 should be increased by
22	a minimum of \$100,000,000;
23	(5) for fiscal year 2001 should be increased by
24	a minimum of \$100,000,000; and

1	(6) for fiscal year 2002 should be increased by
2	a minimum of \$100,000,000;
3	above its fiscal year 1996 appropriation for additional re-
4	search into an anti-addiction drug to block the craving of
5	illicit addictive substances.
6	SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE EXTEN-
7	SION OF THE EMPLOYER EDUCATION ASSIST-
8	ANCE EXCLUSION UNDER SECTION 127 OF
9	THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.
10	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
11	(1) since 1978, over 7,000,000 American workers
12	have benefited from the employer education assistance
13	exclusion under section 127 of the Internal Revenue
14	Code of 1986 by being able to improve their education
15	and acquire new skills without having to pay taxes
16	on the benefit;
17	(2) American companies have benefited by im-
18	proving the education and skills of their employees
19	who in turn can contribute more to their company;
20	(3) the American economy becomes more globally
21	competitive because an educated workforce is able to
22	produce more and to adapt more rapidly to changing
23	technologies;
24	(4) American companies are experiencing un-
25	precedented global competition and the value and ne-

1	cessity of life-long education for their employees has
2	increased;
3	(5) the employer education assistance exclusion
4	was first enacted in 1978;
5	(6) the exclusion has been extended 7 previous
6	times;
7	(7) the last extension expired December 31, 1994;
8	and
9	(8) the exclusion has received broad bipartisan
10	support.
11	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
12	ate that the revenue level assumed in the Budget Resolution
13	accommodate an extension of the employer education assist-
14	ance exclusion under section 127 of the Internal Revenue
15	Code of 1986 from January 1, 1995, through December 31,
16	1996.
17	SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ECO-
18	NOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
19	PLACING HIGH PRIORITY ON MAINTAINING
20	FIELD-BASED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REP-
21	RESENTATIVES.
22	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following find-
23	ings:
24	(1) The Economic Development Administration
25	plays a crucial role in helping economically dis-

- advantaged regions of the United States develop infrastructure that supports and promotes greater economic activity and growth, particularly in nonurban regions.
 - (2) The Economic Development Administration helps to promote industrial park development, business incubators, water and sewer system improvements, vocational and technical training facilities, tourism development strategies, technical assistance and capacity building for local governments, economic adjustment strategies, revolving loan funds, and other projects which the private sector has not generated or will not generate without some assistance from the Government through the Economic Development Administration.
 - (3) The Economic Development Administration maintains 6 regional offices which oversee staff that are designated field-based representatives of the Economic Development Administration, and these field-based representatives provide valuable expertise and counseling on economic planning and development to nonurban communities.
 - (4) The Economic Development Administration Regional Centers are located in the urban areas of

- Austin, Seattle, Denver, Atlanta, Philadelphia, and
 Chicago.
- 3 (5) Because of a 37-percent reduction in ap-4 proved funding for salaries and expenses from fiscal 5 year 1995, the Economic Development Administra-6 tion has initiated staff reductions requiring the elimi-7 nation of 8 field-based positions. The field-based eco-8 nomic development representative positions that are 9 either being eliminated or not replaced after vol-10 untary retirement and which currently interact with 11 nonurban communities on economic development ef-12 forts cover the States of New Mexico, Arizona, Ne-13 vada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Illinois, Indiana, 14 Maine, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and North Caro-15 lina.
- 16 (6) These staff cutbacks will adversely affect
 17 States with very low per-capita personal income, in18 cluding New Mexico which ranks 47th in the Nation
 19 in per-capita personal income, Oklahoma ranking
 20 46th, North Dakota ranking 42nd, Arizona ranking
 21 35th, Maine ranking 34th, and North Carolina rank22 ing 33rd.
- 23 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-24 ate that the functional totals and reconciliations instruc-25 tions underlying this budget resolution assume that—

1	(1) it is regrettable that the Economic Develop-
2	ment Administration has elected to reduce field-based
3	economic development representatives who are fulfill-
4	ing the Economic Development Administration's mis-
5	sion of interacting with and counseling nonurban
6	communities in economically disadvantaged regions
7	of the United States;
8	(2) the Economic Development Administration
9	should take all necessary and appropriate actions to
10	ensure that field-based economic development rep-
11	resentation receives high priority; and
12	(3) the Economic Development Administration
13	should reconsider the planned termination of field-
14	based economic development representatives respon-
15	sible for States that are economically disadvantaged,
16	and that this reconsideration take place without
17	delay.
18	SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REVENUE AS-
19	SUMPTIONS.
20	(a) Findings.—The Congress finds the following:
21	(1) Corporations and individuals have clear re-
22	sponsibility to adhere to environmental laws. When
23	they do not, and environmental damage results, the
24	Federal and State governments may impose fines and

1	penalties, and assess polluters for the cost of remedi-
2	ation.
3	(2) Assessment of these costs is important in the
4	enforcement process. They appropriately penalize
5	wrongdoing. They discourage future environmental
6	damage. They ensure that taxpayers do not bear the
7	financial brunt of cleaning up after damages done by
8	polluters.
9	(3) In the case of the Exxon Valdez oil spill dis-
10	aster in Prince William Sound, Alaska, for example,
11	the corporate settlement with the Federal Government
12	totaled \$900,000,000.
13	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
14	ate that assumptions in this resolution assume an appro-
15	priate amount of revenues per year through legislation that
16	will not allow deductions for fines and penalties arising
17	from a failure to comply with Federal or State environ-
18	mental or health protection laws.
19	SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DOMESTIC VI-
20	OLENCE.
21	The assumptions underlying functional totals and rec-
22	onciliation instructions in this budget resolution include:
23	(1) Findings.—The Senate finds that:
24	(A) Violence against women is the leading
25	cause of physical injury to women. The Depart-

- ment of Justice estimates that over 1 million vio lent crimes against women are committed by do mestic partners annually.
 - (B) Domestic violence dramatically affects the victim's ability to participate in the workforce. A University of Minnesota survey reported that one-quarter of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over half of these women had been harassed by their abuser at work.
 - (C) Domestic violence is often intensified as women seek to gain economic independence through attending school or job training programs. Batterers have been reported to prevent women from attending such programs or sabotage their efforts at self-improvement.
 - (D) Nationwide surveys of service providers prepared by the Taylor Institute of Chicago, Document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that between 50 percent and 80 percent of women in welfare to work programs are current or past victims of domestic violence.
 - (E) The American Psychological Association has reported that violence against women is usu-

ally witnessed by their children, who as a result can suffer severe psychological, cognitive and physical damage and some studies have found that children who witness violence in their homes have a greater propensity to commit violent acts in their homes and communities when they become adults.

- (F) Over half of the women surveyed by the Taylor Institute stayed with their batterers because they lacked the resources to support themselves and their children. The surveys also found that the availability of economic support is a critical factor in women's ability to leave abusive situations that threaten themselves and their children.
- (G) Proposals to restructure the welfare programs may impact the availability of the economic support and the safety net necessary to enable poor women to flee abuse without risking homelessness and starvation for their families.
- (2) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate that:
 - (A) No welfare reform provision should be enacted by Congress unless and until Congress considers whether such welfare reform provisions

1	would exacerbate violence against women and
2	their children, further endanger women's lives,
3	make it more difficult for women to escape do-
4	mestic violence, or further punish women victim-
5	ized by violence.
6	(B) Any welfare reform measure enacted by
7	Congress should require that any welfare to
8	work, education, or job placement programs im-
9	plemented by the States address the impact of
10	domestic violence on welfare recipients.
11	SEC. 321. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING STUDENT LOANS
12	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
13	(1) over the last 60 years, education and ad-
14	vancements in knowledge have accounted for 37 per-
15	cent of our nation's economic growth;
16	(2) a college degree significantly increases job
17	stability, resulting in an unemployment rate among
18	college graduates less than half that of those with high
19	$school\ diplomas;$
20	(3) a person with a bachelor's degree will aver-
21	age 50–55 percent more in lifetime earnings than a
22	person with a high school diploma;
23	(1) advantion is a low to moviding alternatives
	(4) education is a key to providing alternatives

1	for breaking cycles of poverty and moving welfare re-
2	cipients to work;
3	(5) a highly educated populace is necessary to
4	the effective functioning of democracy and to a grow-
5	ing economy, and the opportunity to gain a college
6	education helps advance the American ideals o
7	progress and social equality;
8	(6) a highly educated and flexible work force is
9	an essential component of economic growth and com-
10	petitiveness;
11	(7) for many families, Federal Student Aid Pro-
12	grams make the difference in the ability of students
13	to attend college;
14	(8) in 1994, nearly 6 million postsecondary stu
15	dents received some kind of financial assistance to
16	help them pay for the costs of schooling;
17	(9) since 1988, college costs have risen by 54 per-
18	cent, and student borrowing has increased by 219 per-
19	cent; and
20	(10) in fiscal year 1996, the Balanced Budge
21	Act achieved savings without reducing student loan
22	limits or increasing fees to students or parents.

(b) Sense of Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate

24 that the aggregates and functional levels included in this

25 budget resolution assume that savings in student loans can

1	be achieved without any program change that would in-
2	crease costs to students and parents or decrease accessibility
3	to student loans.
4	SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REDUCTION
5	OF THE NATIONAL DEBT.
6	(a) The Senate finds that—
7	(1) S. Con. Res. 57 projects a public debt in fis-
8	cal year 1997 of \$5,400,000,000,000;
9	(2) S. Con. Res. 57 projects that the public debt
10	will be \$6,500,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 2002
11	when the budget resolution projects a unified budget
12	surplus; and
13	(3) this accumulated debt represents a signifi-
14	cant financial burden that will require excessive tax-
15	ation and lost economic opportunity for future gen-
16	erations of the United States.
17	(b) It is the sense of the Senate that any comprehensive
18	legislation sent to the President that balances the budget
19	by a certain date and that is agreed to by the Congress
20	and the President shall also contain a strategy for reducing
21	the national debt of the United States.
22	SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING HUNGRY OR
23	HOMELESS CHILDREN.
24	(a) It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions
25	in this budget resolution assume that Congress will not

- 1 enact or adopt any legislation that would increase the num-
- 2 ber of children who are hungry or homeless.
- 3 (b) It is the sense of Congress that the assumptions
- 4 in this budget resolution assume that in the event legislation
- 5 enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase
- 6 in the number of hungry or homeless children by the end
- 7 of fiscal year 1997, the Congress would revisit the provi-
- 8 sions of said legislation which caused such increase and
- 9 would, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation
- 10 which would halt any continuation of such increase.

11 SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LIHEAP.

- 12 (a) FINDINGS—The Senate finds that:
- 13 (1) Home energy assistance for working and low-
- income families with children, the elderly on fixed in-
- 15 comes, the disabled, and others who need such aid is
- a critical part of the social safety net in cold-weather
- areas during the winter, and a source of necessary
- 18 cooling aid during the summer;
- 19 (2) LIHEAP is a highly targeted, cost-effective
- 20 way to help millions of low-income Americans pay
- 21 their home energy bills. More than two-thirds of
- 22 LIHEAP-eligible households have annual incomes of
- less than \$8,000, more than one-half have annual in-
- 24 comes below \$6,000; and

1	(3) LIHEAP funding has been substantially re-
2	duced in recent years, and cannot sustain further
3	spending cuts if the program is to remain a viable
4	means of meeting the home heating and other energy-
5	related needs of low-income families, especially those
6	in cold-weather States.
7	(b) Sense of the Senate.—The assumptions under-
8	lying this budget resolution assume that it is the sense of
9	the Senate that the funds made available for LIHEAP for
10	fiscal year 1997 will be not less than the actual expenditures
11	made for LIHEAP in fiscal year 1996.
12	SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING ADDI-
13	TIONAL CHARGES UNDER THE MEDICARE
14	PROGRAM.
15	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
15 16	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that— (1) senior citizens must spend more than 1 dol-
16	(1) senior citizens must spend more than 1 dol-
16 17	(1) senior citizens must spend more than 1 dol- lar in 5 of their limited incomes to purchase the
16 17 18	(1) senior citizens must spend more than 1 dol- lar in 5 of their limited incomes to purchase the health care they need;
16 17 18 19	(1) senior citizens must spend more than 1 dollar in 5 of their limited incomes to purchase the health care they need; (2) 2/3 of spending under the medicare program
16 17 18 19 20	(1) senior citizens must spend more than 1 dollar in 5 of their limited incomes to purchase the health care they need; (2) 2/3 of spending under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act is for
16 17 18 19 20 21	(1) senior citizens must spend more than 1 dollar in 5 of their limited incomes to purchase the health care they need; (2) 2/3 of spending under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act is for senior citizens with annual incomes of less than
16 17 18 19 20 21	(1) senior citizens must spend more than 1 dollar in 5 of their limited incomes to purchase the health care they need; (2) 2/3 of spending under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act is for senior citizens with annual incomes of less than \$15,000;

1	(4) senior citizens enrolling in private insurance
2	plans receiving medicare capitation payments are
3	currently protected against excess charges by health
4	providers and additional premium charges by the
5	plan for services covered under the medicare program.
6	(b) Sense of the Congress.—It the sense of the
7	Congress that any reconciliation bill considered during the
8	second session of the 104th Congress should maintain the
9	existing prohibitions against additional charges by provid-
10	ers under the medicare program under title XVIII of the
11	Social Security Act ("balance billing"), and any premium
12	surcharges for services covered under such program that are
13	levied on senior citizens enrolled in private insurance plans
14	in lieu of conventional medicare.
15	SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING NURSING
	SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING NURSING
16	HOME STANDARDS.
16 17 18	HOME STANDARDS.
17	HOME STANDARDS. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
17 18	HOME STANDARDS. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that— (1) prior to the enactment of subtitle C of title
17 18 19	HOME STANDARDS. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that— (1) prior to the enactment of subtitle C of title IV of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987,
17 18 19 20	HOME STANDARDS. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that— (1) prior to the enactment of subtitle C of title IV of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987, deplorable conditions and shocking abuse of senior
17 18 19 20 21	HOME STANDARDS. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that— (1) prior to the enactment of subtitle C of title IV of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987, deplorable conditions and shocking abuse of senior citizens and the disabled in nursing homes was wide-

1	home conditions and substantially reduced abuse of
2	senior citizens.
3	(b) Sense of the Congress.—It the sense of the
4	Congress that any reconciliation bill considered during the
5	second session of the 104th Congress should not include any
6	changes in Federal nursing home quality standards or the
7	Federal enforcement of such standards.
8	SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS CONCERNING NURSING
9	HOME CARE.
10	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
11	(1) under current Federal law—
12	(A) protections are provided under the med-
13	icaid program under title XIX of the Social Se-
14	curity Act to prevent the impoverishment of
15	spouses of nursing home residents;
16	(B) prohibitions exist under such program
17	to prevent the charging of adult children of nurs-
18	ing home residents for the cost of the care of such
19	residents;
20	(C) prohibitions exist under such program
21	to prevent a State from placing a lien against
22	the home of a nursing home resident, if that
23	home was occupied by a spouse or dependent
24	child; and

1	(D) prohibitions exist under such program
2	to prevent a nursing home from charging
3	amounts above the medicaid recognized charge
4	for medicaid patients or requiring a commit-
5	ment to make private payments prior to receiv-
6	ing medicaid coverage as a condition of admis-
7	sion; and
8	(2) family members of nursing home residents
9	are generally unable to afford the high cost of nursing
10	home care, which ranges between \$30,000 and \$60,000
11	a year.
12	(b) Sense of the Congress.—It is the sense of the
13	Congress that provisions of the medicaid program under
14	title XIX of the Social Security Act that protect families
15	of nursing home residents from experiencing financial ruin
16	as the price of securing needed care for their loved ones
17	should be retained, including—
18	(1) spousal impoverishment rules;
19	(2) prohibitions against charging adult children
20	of nursing home patients for the cost of their care;
21	(3) prohibitions against liens on the homes of
22	nursing home residents occupied by a spouse or de-
23	pendent child; and
24	(4) prohibitions against nursing homes requiring
25	private payments prior to medicaid coverage as a

1	condition of admission or allowing charges in addi
2	tion to medicaid payments for covered patients.
3	SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING REQUIRE
4	MENTS THAT WELFARE RECEIPTS BE DRUG
5	FREE.
6	In recognition of the fact that American workers are
7	required to be drug-free in the workplace, it is the sense
8	of the Congress that this concurrent resolution on the budge
9	assumes that the States may require welfare recipients to
10	be drug-free as a condition for receiving such benefits and
11	that random drug testing may be used to enforce such re-
12	quirements.
13	SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON DAVIS-BACON.
14	Notwithstanding any provision of the committee report
15	on this resolution, it is the sense of the Senate that the pro-
16	visions in this resolution do not assume the repeal of the
17	Davis-Bacon Act.
18	SEC. 330. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON DAVIS-BACON.
19	Notwithstanding any provision of the committee report
20	on this resolution, it is the sense of the Senate that the pro-

21 visions in this resolution assume reform of the Davis-Bacon

22 *Act*.

1	SEC. 331. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REIMBURSEMENT OF
2	THE UNITED STATES FOR OPERATIONS
3	SOUTHERN WATCH AND PROVIDE COMFORT.
4	(a) Findings.—The Congress finds that—
5	(1) as of May 1996, the United States has spent
6	\$2,937,000,000 of United States taxpayer funds since
7	the conclusion of the Gulf War in 1991 for the sin-
8	gular purpose of protecting the Kurdish and Shiite
9	population from Iraqi aggression;
10	(2) the President's defense budget request for
11	1997 includes an additional \$590,100,000 for Oper-
12	ations Southern Watch and Provide Comfort, both of
13	which are designed to restrict Iraqi military aggres-
14	sion against the Kurdish and Shiite people of Iraq;
15	(3) costs for these military operations constitute
16	part of the continued budget deficit of the United
17	States; and
18	(4) United Nations Security Council Resolution
19	986 (1995) (referred to as "SCR 986") would allow
20	Iraq to sell up to \$1,000,000,000 in petroleum and
21	petroleum products every 90 days, for an initial pe-
22	riod of 180 days.
23	(b) Sense of the Congress.—It is the sense of the
24	Congress that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
25	tals in this resolution assume that—

	102
1	(1) the President should instruct the United
2	States Permanent Representative to the United Na-
3	tions to ensure any subsequent extension of authority
4	beyond the 180 days originally provided by SCR 986,
5	specifically mandates and authorizes the reimburse-
6	ment of the United States for costs associated with
7	Operations Southern Watch and Provide Comfort out
8	of revenues generated by any sale of petroleum or pe-
9	$troleum\hbox{-}related\ products\ originating\ from\ Iraq;$
10	(2) in the event that the United States Perma-
11	nent Representative to the United Nations fails to
12	modify the terms of any subsequent resolution extend-
13	ing the authority granted by SCR 986 as called for
14	in paragraph (1), the President should reject any
15	United Nations' action or resolution seeking to extend
16	the terms of the oil sale beyond the 180 days author-
17	ized by SCR 986;
18	(3) the President should take the necessary steps
19	to ensure that—

- to ensure that—
 - (A) any effort by the United Nations to temporarily lift the trade embargo for humanitarian purposes, specifically the sale of petroleum or petroleum products, restricts all revenues from such sale from being diverted to benefit the Iraqi military; and

21

22

23

24

1	(B) the temporary lifting of the trade em-
2	bargo does not encourage other countries to take
3	steps to begin promoting commercial relations
4	with the Iraqi military in expectation that sanc-
5	tions will be permanently lifted; and
6	(4) revenues reimbursed to the United States
7	from the oil sale authorized by SCR 986, or any sub-
8	sequent action or resolution, should be used to reduce
9	the Federal budget deficit.
10	SEC. 332. ACCURATE INDEX FOR INFLATION.
11	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
12	(1) a significant portion of Federal expenditures
13	and revenues are indexed to measurements of infla-
14	tion; and
15	(2) a variety of inflation indices exist which
16	vary according to the accuracy with which such indi-
17	ces measure increases in the cost of living; and
18	(3) Federal Government usage of inflation indi-
19	ces which overstate true inflation has the dem-
20	onstrated effect of accelerating Federal spending, in-
21	creasing the Federal budget deficit, increasing Federal
22	borrowing, and thereby enlarging the projected burden
23	on future American taxpayers.
24	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
25	ate that the assumptions underlying this budget resolution

1	include that all Federal spending and revenues which are
2	indexed for inflation should be calibrated by the most accu-
3	rate inflation indices which are available to the Federal
4	Government.
5	SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOLVENCY OF THE
6	MEDICARE TRUST FUND.
7	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that repeal of certain
8	provisions from the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of
9	1993 would move the insolvency date of the HI (Medicare)
10	Trust Fund forward by a full year.
11	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
12	ate that no provisions in this Budget Resolution should
13	worsen the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund.
14	SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT THE 1993 INCOME
15	TAX INCREASE ON SOCIAL SECURITY BENE-
16	FITS SHOULD BE REPEALED.
17	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that the assumptions
18	underlying this resolution include that—
19	(1) the fiscal year 1994 budget proposal of Presi-
20	dent Clinton to raise Federal income taxes on the So-
21	cial Security benefits of senior citizens with income
22	as low as \$25,000, and those provisions of the fiscal
23	year 1994 recommendations of the Budget Resolution
24	and the 1993 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act in
25	which the One Hundred Third Congress voted to raise

1	Federal income taxes on the Social Security benefits
2	of senior citizens with income as low as \$34,000
3	should be repealed;
4	(2) the Senate Budget Resolution should reflect
5	President Clinton's statement that he believed he
6	raised Federal taxes too much in 1993; and
7	(3) the Budget Resolution should react to Presi-
8	dent Clinton's fiscal year 1997 budget which docu-
9	ments the fact that in the history of the United
10	States, the total tax burden has never been greater
11	than it is today, therefore
12	(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of the Con-
13	gress that the assumptions underlying this Resolution in-
14	clude—
15	(1) that raising Federal income taxes in 1993 on
16	the Social Security benefits of middle-class individ-
17	uals with income as low as \$34,000 was a mistake;
18	(2) that the Federal income tax hike on Social
19	Security benefits imposed in 1993 by the One Hun-
20	dred Third Congress and signed into law by President
21	Clinton should be repealed; and
22	(3) President Clinton should work with the Con-
23	gress to repeal the 1993 Federal income tax hike on
24	Social Security benefits in a manner that would not
25	adversely affect the Social Security Trust Fund or the

1	Medicare Part A Trust Fund, and should ensure that
2	such repeal is coupled with offsetting reductions in
3	Federal spending.
4	SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ADMIN-
5	ISTRATION'S PRACTICE REGARDING THE
6	PROSECUTION OF DRUG SMUGGLERS.
7	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
8	(1) drug use is devastating to the Nation, par-
9	ticularly among juveniles, and has led juveniles to be-
10	come involved in interstate gangs and to participate
11	in violent crime;
12	(2) drug use has experienced a dramatic resur-
13	gence among our youth;
14	(3) the number of youths aged 12–17 using
15	marijuana has increased from 1.6 million in 1992 to
16	2.9 million in 1994, and the category of "recent mari-
17	juana use" increased a staggering 200 percent among
18	14- to 15-year-olds over the same period;
19	(4) since 1992, there has been a 52 percent jump
20	in the number of high school seniors using drugs on
21	a monthly basis, even as worrisome declines are noted
22	in peer disapproval of drug use;
23	(5) 1 in 3 high school students uses marinana

1	(6) 12- to 17-year-olds who use marijuana are
2	85 percent more likely to graduate to cocaine than
3	those who abstain from marijuana;
4	(7) juveniles who reach 21 without ever having
5	used drugs almost never try them later in life;
6	(8) the latest results from the Drug Abuse Warn-
7	ing Network show that marijuana-related episodes
8	jumped 39 percent and are running at 155 percent
9	above the 1990 level, and that methamphetamine
10	cases have risen 256 percent over the 1991 level;
11	(9) between February 1993 and February 1995
12	the retail price of a gram of cocaine fell from \$172
13	to \$137, and that of a gram of heroin also fell from
14	\$2,032 to \$1,278;
15	(10) it has been reported that the Department of
16	Justice, through the United States Attorney for the
17	Southern District of California, has adopted a policy
18	of allowing certain foreign drug smugglers to avoid
19	prosecution altogether by being released to Mexico;
20	(11) it has been reported that in the past year
21	approximately 2,300 suspected narcotics traffickers
22	were taken into custody for bringing illegal drugs
23	across the border, but approximately one in four were
24	returned to their country of origin without being

prosecuted;

1	(12) it has been reported that the United States
2	Customs Service is operating under guidelines limit-
3	ing any prosecution in marijuana cases to cases in-
4	volving 125 pounds of marijuana or more;
5	(13) it has been reported that suspects possessing
6	as much as 32 pounds of methamphetamine and
7	37,000 Quaalude tablets, were not prosecuted but
8	were, instead, allowed to return to their countries of
9	origin after their drugs and vehicles were confiscated;
10	(14) it has been reported that after a seizure of
11	158 pounds of cocaine, one defendant was cited and
12	released because there was no room at the Federal jail
13	and charges against here were dropped;
14	(15) it has been reported that some smugglers
15	have been caught two or more times—even in the
16	same week—yet still were not prosecuted;
17	(16) the number of defendants prosecuted for vio-
18	lations of the Federal drug laws has dropped from
19	25,033 in 1992 to 22,926 in 1995;
20	(17) this Congress has increased the funding of
21	the Federal Bureau of Prisons by 11.7 percent over
22	the 1995 appropriations level; and
23	(18) this Congress has increased the funding of
24	the Immigration and Naturalization Service by 23.5
25	percent over the 1995 appropriations level.

1	(b) Sense of Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate
2	that—(1) the functional totals underlying this resolution
3	assume that the Attorney General promptly should inves-
4	tigate this matter and report, within 30 days, to the Chair
5	of the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary; and
6	(2) the Attorney General should ensure that cases in-
7	volving the smuggling of drugs into the United States are
8	vigorously prosecuted.
9	SEC. 336. CORPORATE SUBSIDIES AND SALE OF GOVERN-
10	MENT ASSETS.
11	(a) Corporate Subsidies.—It is the sense of the
12	Senate that the functional levels and aggregates in this
13	budget resolution assume that—
14	(1) the Federal budget contains tens of billions of
15	dollars in payments, benefits and programs that pri-
16	marily assist profit-making enterprises and industries
17	rather than provide a clear and compelling public in-
18	terest;
19	(2) corporate subsidies can provide unfair com-
20	petitive advantages to certain industries and industry
21	segments;
22	(3) at a time when millions of Americans are
23	being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget,
24	the corporate sector should bear its share of the bur-
25	den; and

1	(4) Federal payments, benefits, and programs
2	which predominantly benefit a particular industry or
3	segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear
4	and compelling public benefit, should be reformed or
5	terminated in order to provide additional tax relief,
6	deficit reduction, or to achieve the savings necessary
7	to meet this resolution's instructions and levels.
8	(b) Sale of Government Assets.—
9	(1) Budgetary treatment.—
10	(A) In general.—For the purposes of any
11	concurrent resolution on the budget and the Con-
12	gressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts real-
13	ized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with
14	respect to the level of budget authority, outlays,
15	or revenues if such sale would cause an increase
16	in the deficit as calculated pursuant to subpara-
17	graph(B).
18	(B) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT
19	VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale
20	shall be the net present value of the cash flow
21	from—
22	(i) proceeds from the asset sale;
23	(ii) future receipts that would be ex-
24	pected from continued ownership of the
25	asset by the Government; and

1	(iii) expected future spending by the
2	Government at a level necessary to continue
3	to operate and maintain the asset to gen-
4	erate the receipts estimated pursuant to
5	clause (ii).
6	(2) Definitions.—For purposes of this section,
7	the term "sale of an asset" shall have the same mean-
8	ing as under section $250(c)(21)$ of the Balanced Budg-
9	et and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.
10	(3) Treatment of loan assets.—For the pur-
11	poses of this subsection, the sale of loan assets or the
12	prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms
13	of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.
14	SEC. 337. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE PRESIDENTIAL
15	ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND.
16	It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions un-
17	derlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that
18	when the Finance Committee meets its outlay and revenue
19	obligations under this resolution the committee should not
20	make any changes in the Presidential Election Campaign
21	Fund or its funding mechanism and should meet its revenue
22	and outlay targets through other programs within its juris-
23	diction.

1 SEC. 338. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING WELFARE RE-

2	FORM.
3	(a) The Senate finds that—
4	(1) S. Con. Res. 57 assumes substantial savings
5	from welfare reform; and
6	(2) children born out of wedlock are five times
7	more likely to be poor and about ten times more likely
8	to be extremely poor and therefore are more likely to
9	receive welfare benefits than children from two parent
10	families; and
11	(3) high rates of out-of-wedlock births are associ-
12	ated with a host of other social pathologies; for exam-
13	ple, children of single mothers are twice as likely to
14	drop out of high school; boys whose fathers are absent
15	are more likely to engage in criminal activities; and
16	girls in single-parent families are three times more
17	likely to have children out of wedlock themselves;
18	therefore
19	(b) It is the sense of the Senate that any comprehensive
20	legislation sent to the President that balances the budget
21	by a certain date and that includes welfare reform provi-
22	sions and that is agreed to by the Congress and the Presi-
23	dent shall also contain to the maximum extent possible a
24	strategy for reducing the rate of out-of-wedlock births and
25	encouraging family formation

1	SEC. 339. A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SENATE'S SUP-
2	PORT FOR FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW
3	ENFORCEMENT.
4	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
5	(1) our Federal, State, and local law enforcement
6	officers provide essential services that preserve and
7	protect our freedoms and security;
8	(2) law enforcement officers deserve our appre-
9	ciation and support;
10	(3) law enforcement officers and agencies are
11	under increasing attacks, both to their physical safety
12	and to their reputations;
13	(4) Federal, State, and local law enforcement ef-
14	forts need increased financial commitment from the
15	Federal Government for funding and financial assist-
16	ance and not the slashing of our commitment to law
17	enforcement if they are to carry out their efforts to
18	combat violent crime;
19	(5) the President's fiscal year 1996 budget re-
20	quested an increase of 14.8 percent for the Federal
21	Bureau of Investigation, 10 percent for United States
22	Attorneys, and \$4,000,000 for Organized Crime Drug
23	Enforcement Task Forces; while this Congress has in-
24	creased funding for the Federal Bureau of Investiga-
25	tion by 10.8 percent, 8.4 percent for United States At-

1	torneys, and a cut of \$15,000,000 for Organized
2	Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces;
3	(6) on May 16, 1996, the House of Representa-
4	tives has nonetheless voted to slash \$300,000,000 from
5	the President's \$5,000,000,000 budget request for the
6	Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund for fiscal year
7	1997 in House Concurrent Resolution 178; and
8	(7) the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund as
9	adopted by the Violent Crime Control and Law En-
10	forcement Act of 1994 fully funds the Violent Crime
11	Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 without
12	adding to the Federal budget deficit.
13	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
14	ate that the provisions and the functional totals underlying
15	this resolution assume the Federal Government's commit-
16	ment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and pro-
17	grams to assist State and local efforts shall be maintained
18	and funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund
19	shall not be cut as the resolution adopted by the House of
20	Representatives would require.
21	SEC. 340. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE FUND-
22	ING OF AMTRAK.
23	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
24	(1) a capital funding stream is essential to the
25	ability of the National Rail Passenger Corporation

1	("Amtrak") to reduce its dependence on Federal oper-
2	ating support; and
3	(2) Amtrak needs a secure source of financing,
4	no less favorable than provided to other modes of
5	transportation, for capital improvements.
6	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
7	ate that—
8	(1) revenues attributable to one-half cent per gal-
9	lon of the excise taxes imposed on gasoline, special
10	motor fuel, and diesel fuel from the Mass Transit Ac-
11	count should be dedicated to a new Intercity Pas-
12	senger Rail Trust Fund during the period January 1,
13	1997, through September 30, 2001;
14	(2) revenues would not be deposited in the Inter-
15	city Passenger Rail Trust Fund during any fiscal
16	year to the extent that the deposit is estimated to re-
17	sult in available revenues in the Mass Transit Ac-
18	count being insufficient to satisfy that year's esti-
19	mated appropriation levels;
20	(3) monies in the Intercity Passenger Rail Trust
21	Fund should be generally available to fund, on a re-
22	imbursement basis, capital expenditures incurred by
23	Amtrak; and
24	(4) amounts to fund capital expenditures related
25	to rail operations should be set aside for each State

1	that has not had Amtrak service in such State for the
2	preceding year.
3	SEC. 341. SENSE OF THE SENATE—TRUTH IN BUDGETING.
4	It is the sense of the Senate that:
5	(1) The Congressional Budget Office has scored
6	revenue expected to be raised from the auction of Fed-
7	eral Communications Commission licenses for various
8	services;
9	(2) For budget scoring purposes, the Congress
10	has assumed that such auctions would occur in a
11	prompt and expeditious manner and that revenue
12	raised by such auctions would flow to the Federal
13	treasury;
14	(3) The Resolution assumes that the revenue to
15	be raised from auctions totals billions of dollars;
16	(4) The Resolution makes assumptions that serv-
17	ices would be auctioned where the Federal Commu-
18	nications Commission has not yet conducted auctions
19	for such services, such as Local Multipoint Distribu-
20	tion Service (LMDS), licenses for paging services,
21	final broadband PCS licenses, narrow band PCS li-
22	censes, licenses for unserved cellular, and Digital
23	Audio Radio (DARS), and other subscription services,

revenue from which has been assumed in Congres-

1	sional budgetary calculations and in determining the
2	level of the deficit; and

(5) The Commission's service rules can dramatically affect license values and auction revenues and therefore the Commission should act expeditiously and without further delay to conduct auctions of licenses in a manner that maximizes revenue, increases efficiency, and enhances competition for any service for which auction revenues have been scored by the Congressional Budget Office and/or counted for budgetary purposes in an Act of Congress.

Attest:

Secretary.

104TH CONGRESS H. CON. RES. 178

AMENDMENT

 HCON 178 EAS
 2

 HCON 178 EAS
 3

 HCON 178 EAS
 4

 HCON 178 EAS
 5

 HCON 178 EAS
 6

 HCON 178 EAS
 7

 HCON 178 EAS
 9

 HCON 178 EAS
 10